

## **Saul of Tarsus and Early Zealotism**

### **Reading Gal 1,13-14 in Light of Philo's Writings**

One of the most consistent features in the portraits of Saul of Tarsus in the Acts of the Apostles and in the letters accredited to Paul, is the fervent zeal of his youth. According to Acts he described himself as “educated according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers, being zealous for God” (Acts 22,3); in Gal 1,14 Paul writes that he “advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, *so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers*” (... , περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής υπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων; cf. also Phil 3,6: κατὰ ζήλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). But what kind of zealot might he have been?

The references of Paul in regards to his zeal have been dealt with in several studies. Most of these studies point out that Paul's zeal should be read in light of the zealotry in vogue in the first century C.E. Palestine; but the results of these investigations are varied and the conclusions concerning the nature of his zeal are rather diverse. Some of this confusion may be due to the fact that not all of the relevant information about zealotry at the time of Paul has been taken into consideration<sup>(1)</sup>. The present study will try to remedy part of this failure by pointing to the often overlooked phenomenon of zealotry in the writings of the Jewish scholar and philosopher Philo of Alexandria. Even though he lived in Alexandria, he was not without contact with Palestine traditions, and he visited Palestine at least once (Prob. 64)<sup>(2)</sup>. Philo has, moreover, several references to both zeal and zealotry that should be drawn upon when searching for the possible nature and character of Paul's zealotry.

It is the thesis of the present article that Philo's expositions of zeal for God/Torah, particularly his considerations of violent zealotry, strongly support the view that the early zealots probably did not form

<sup>(1)</sup>M. HENGEL has, e.g., very few references to zeal or zealots in the works of Philo of Alexandria in his magisterial volume on *The Zealots*. Most other scholars have followed in this lead. See, e.g., M. HENGEL, *The Zealots*. Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D. (Edinburgh 1989); furthermore, e.g., M. BORG, “The Currency of the Term ‘Zealot’”, *JTS* 22 (1971) 504-12; C. MÉZANGE, “Simon le Zélote était-il un révolutionnaire?”, *Bib* 81 (2000) 489-506.

any consistent party or movement, but were vigilant individuals who took the Law in their own hands when observing cases of gross Torah transgressions. This view should be considered important when trying to understand the role of zeal in the early life of Paul. As most studies of the zeal of Paul also deal with the issue of zealotry in Palestine, we will start by reviewing the positions in recent research concerning the nature of this zealotry, including the various positions taken in recent studies on the zeal of Paul. Our main part, however, deals with the issue of Paul's zeal in Gal 1,13-14, working out some corollaries from the works of Philo for understanding the statements of Paul about his own zealotry.

### I. Dominating Paradigms in Recent Research on the Zealots

The dominant paradigms today on the nature of the early zealotry are primarily three; that the zealots represented a specific party, spanning half of the first century C.E.; that the zealots were primarily violent individuals, not forming any specific form of group before the time of the Great War, and that the zealots were a kind of bandit movement, emerging during the years of the Great War 66-70 C.E. Furthermore, there are several views in vogue on the nature of the zeal of Paul<sup>(2)</sup>.

#### 1. *The Zealot-Party theory; the Hengel paradigm*

One of the most prolific and influential writers on the zealots has been Martin Hengel. He argues that 'Zealots' is a pertinent name and characterization of the Palestinian freedom movement that originated with Judas the Galilean in 6 C.E. This movement reached its peak in the Jewish War: "the 'Zealots' formed a relatively exclusive and unified movement with its own distinctive religious view and <that> they had a crucial influence on the history of Palestinian Judaism in the distinctive period between 6 and 70 A.D."<sup>(4)</sup>. Hengel calls this movement the Jewish 'freedom movement' or the Jewish 'liberation movement,' and he finds that it did not consist of different groups, but

<sup>(2)</sup>On Philo, his life and works, see now P. BORGES, *Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time* (NTS 86; Leiden 1997).

<sup>(3)</sup>The most recent review of the various viewpoints on the Zealots is probably D. RHOADS, "Zealots", *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York 1992) VI, 1043-54. See also N.T. WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, in *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (London 1996) 170-181, and M.R. FAIRCHILD, "Paul's Pre-Christian Zealot Associations: A Re-Examination of Gal 1.14 and Acts 22.3", *NTS* 45 (1999) 514-532.

<sup>(4)</sup>HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 5.

that Josephus applies various terms for the same party. Hengel finds the earliest evidence for 'Zealots' as a party name in the New Testament's descriptions of some of the disciples of Jesus<sup>(5)</sup>, i.e., the term was in use already at about 30 C.E. The central model for all these 'Zealots' was the zeal and action of Phinehas (Num 25). Furthermore, he argues that the realization of such a zeal as that of Phinehas, that is the eradication of transgressors of the Law and the destruction of the pagans who led Israel astray, "called for an organized group ... and could not be accomplished by individual desperados"<sup>(6)</sup>. Such zeal, however, was not really confined to the zealots. It was something that concerned the whole of Palestinian Judaism at that time in form of a readiness to avenge every form of sacrilege. 'Zeal' was thus a typical element of piety in late Judaism<sup>(7)</sup>. Hence, while on the one hand postulating a specific zealotic party, according to Hengel, it was also a "typical element" of first century C.E. Judaism<sup>(8)</sup>.

Hengel's view of the term 'Zealots' as designating a long-lasting party or party members did gain a role as the common view among many biblical scholars<sup>(9)</sup>. It has, however, also been challenged.

## 2. *The Zealots as individuals; the Smith-Morin paradigm*

Morton Smith<sup>(10)</sup> has been one of the most prominent scholars arguing that the early zealots did not belong to or constitute any explicit party, but were individuals who championed zeal through their violent actions<sup>(11)</sup>. According to Smith, the zealots did not come into existence as a party until the winter of 67-68 CE. There had, indeed, been many individual zealots before that time; in fact, from at least the

<sup>(5)</sup> Cf. Luke 6,15; Acts 1,13; Matt 10,4; Mark 3,18.

<sup>(6)</sup> M. HENGEL, "Zealots and Sicarii. The Question of the Unity and Diversity of the Jewish Freedom Movement in 6-74 A.D.", in *The Zealots*, 380-404.

<sup>(7)</sup> HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 177-183.

<sup>(8)</sup> See here also K. WEGENAST, "Zeloten", *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart 1967) XVIII, column 2474-99.

<sup>(9)</sup> See e.g., H. SCHWIER, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung. Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten Jüdisch-römischen Krieg* (66-74 n.Chr.) (NTOA 11; Göttingen 1989) 131-138; H.P. KINGDON, "The Origins of the Zealots", *NTS* 19 (1972) 74-81; MÉZANGE, "Simon le Zélote-", 489-506.

<sup>(10)</sup> M. SMITH, "Zealots and Sicarii: Their Origins and Relations", *HTR* 64 (1971) 1-19.

<sup>(11)</sup> See also J.A. MORIN, "Les deux derniers des douze: Simon le Zélote et Judas Isakariôth", *RB* 80 (1975) 332-49, and partly BORG, "The Currency of the Term 'Zealot'".

Maccabean times many Jews fostered the ideal of “zeal” and individuals undertook to be, or were thought to be, “zealots” on the model of Phinehas and Elijah<sup>(12)</sup>. Such admiration for violent zeal was presumably also influential in shaping the resistance to Roman government, but there is no clear evidence, according to Smith, that they formed a definite party before during the War<sup>(13)</sup>. This view of the early zealots as being violent individuals has been strongly supported by Morin, and is also argued by others<sup>(14)</sup>.

### 3. *The Zealots as bandits in the years of 66-70; the Horsley paradigm*

R.H. Horsley finds the zealots to be a recognizable party only during the years of the great War of 66-70 C.E.<sup>(15)</sup>. Furthermore, the various designations used by Josephus, as ‘robbers’, ‘Sicarii’ and ‘Zealots’, do not denote members of one and the same movement, but are to be read as designations of various groups and coalitions. An organized movement of religiously motivated national resistance, operative since 6 C.E., never existed. Josephus uses the term ‘Zealots’ to refer to a party that did not evolve until the middle of the War of 66-70 C.E.; they had nothing directly to do with the so-called Fourth Philosophy (Ant 18,23-25), Judas the Galilean or the Sicarii<sup>(16)</sup>.

<sup>(12)</sup> On this aspect, see especially W.R. FARMER, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (New York 1956).

<sup>(13)</sup> Morin here talks about “une mutation provoquée par une situation nouvelle.” MORIN, “Les deux derniers des douze: Simon le zélote et Judas Isakariôth”, 347.

<sup>(14)</sup> See P. BARNETT, *Jesus and the Rise of Early Christianity*. A History of New Testament Times (Downers Grove, Ill. 1999) 54: “It was not so much a movement as a mindset triggered into action at special moments.” Cf. also my work: T. SELAND, *Establishment Violence in Philo & Luke*. A Study of Non-Conformity to the Torah & Jewish Vigilante Reactions (BIS 15; Leiden 1995).

<sup>(15)</sup> See especially R.A. HORSLEY, “The Sicarii: Ancient Jewish ‘Terrorists’”, *JR* 59 (1979) 435-458; R.A. HORSLEY, “‘Like One of the Prophets of Old’: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus”, *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-463; R.A. HORSLEY – J.S. HANSON, *Bandits, Prophets and Messiahs*. Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus (Minneapolis 1985); R.A. HORSLEY, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*. Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine (San Francisco 1987). See also BORG, “The Currency of the Term ‘Zealot’”.

<sup>(16)</sup> Horsley draws here heavily on the work of Foakes-Jackson and Lake, and of Smith; cf. F.J. FOAKES-JACKSON and K. LAKE, “Appendix A: The Zealots”, *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles (eds. F.J. FOAKES-JACKSON – K. LAKE (London 1939) 421-425; SMITH, “Zealots and Sicarii: Their Origins and Relations”.

As to the 'zeal' for God/the Torah so prominent in the studies mentioned above, Horsley argues that there is very little evidence that a 'zeal for the Law' was an important factor in first-century Palestine, let alone as a passion for freedom from alien rule. Zeal for the Law was not a collective movement, but an individual feeling about the importance of other Jews' Torah-observance, and was not directed against the foreigners or Roman rulers. "There is nothing to suggest that one who was zealous for the Torah was an 'extreme nationalist' (<sup>17</sup>).

Horsley draws heavily on sociological theories and models of banditry in order to understand the various groups and conflicts of the last decades before the War (<sup>18</sup>). According to Horsley, neither the zeal for the Torah, nor the 'Zealots' are concepts very helpful for understanding the last decades before the War, and the Zealot party did not come into being before the years of the great War of 66-70 C.E. (<sup>19</sup>).

#### 4. *Saul/Paul as a zealot in recent research*

In Gal 1,13-14.23 and Phil 3,5 the zeal of Paul seems to be related to his persecutions of the early Christians. Earlier studies of the persecutions of Paul, however, did not always pay much attention to the character and role of his zeal. Psychological reasonings, e.g., explanations of Paul's persecutions on the background of his supposed dissatisfaction with his life under the Law were sometimes offered, and/or he was supposed to persecute the belief he in fact was already convinced of (<sup>20</sup>).

Klaus Haacker, however, in his 1975 article on the call of Paul, focused on Paul's zeal as important for understanding his

(<sup>17</sup>) HORSLEY, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 122.

(<sup>18</sup>) See the discussion of Horsley's view and methods in S. FREYNE, "Bandits in Galilee: A Contribution to the Study of Social Condition in First-Century Palestine", *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*, Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee (eds. J. NEUSNER – P. BORG – E.S. FRERICH – R.A. HORSLEY) (Philadelphia 1989) 50-68; T.L. DONALDSON, "Rural Bandits, City Mobs and the Zealots", *JSJ* 21 (1990) 19-40.

(<sup>19</sup>) For a pertinent criticism of central parts of Horsley's use of the category 'bandits', see WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 155-60.

(<sup>20</sup>) See the references given in footnote 15 of T.L. DONALDSON, "Zealot and Convert: The Origin of Paul's Christ-Torah Antithesis", *CBQ* 51 (1989) 658-659. See also R.N. LONGENECKER, *Paul, Apostle of Liberty* (Grand Rapids 1964) 86-105. On the 'exit' of this weak consciousness of Paul, cf. K. STENDAHL, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West", *HTR* 56 (1963) 198-215.

persecutions<sup>(21)</sup>. The zeal of Paul is not, according to Haacker, to be understood as a psychological category, but as “eine klare theologische Kategorie.” Being a Pharisee, the Law was his ruling measure; as a persecutor, the zeal was his “verpflichtende Norm, das bestimmende Leitbild”<sup>(22)</sup>. ‘Zeal’ is here understood as a term for a violent religious intolerance, having its roots in the times of the Maccabees. It was not primarily directed against foreigners, but towards renegade co-fellows. Hence Paul is not to be understood as a member of a militant zealotic organization; Haacker finds it highly doubtful if such ever existed. The term designates Paul as belonging to the radical wing of the Pharisees; perhaps one should think of the Schammaitic school among the Pharisees<sup>(23)</sup>.

T.L. Donaldson too emphasizes that the ideal of zeal was by no means restricted to opposition to foreign oppression. Furthermore, when Paul described himself as a zealot the term did not designate him as a member of an identifiable party. As the term was derived from the OT prototypes Phinehas (Num 25); Elija (1 Kgs 18–19), and Simeon and Levi (Gen 34), and the later Maccabees (1 Macc), “zeal denoted a willingness to use violence against any - Jew, Gentiles, or the wicked in general- who were contravening, opposing, or subverting the Torah. Further, a zealot was willing to suffer and die for the sake of the Torah, even to die at one’s own hand”<sup>(24)</sup>.

J. Taylor is perhaps the scholar who, in recent times, has argued most firmly that the zeal of Paul should be understood on the basis of his membership among the zealots. Drawing upon the work of M. Hengel, he reads ζηλωτής as clearly denoting a follower of what Josephus represents as the ‘fourth philosophy’. He thus argues that these “appear to be good reasons to think of Paul — at least at an early stage of his career — as a Jewish religious nationalist”<sup>(25)</sup>. J. Taylor

<sup>(21)</sup> See K. HAACKER, “Die Berufung des Verfolgers und die Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen”, *ThBeit* 6 (1975) 1-19. A.J. HULTGREN, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale and Nature”, *JBL* 95 (1976) 97-111, however, does not deal with the zeal of Paul as a persecutor.

<sup>(22)</sup> HAACKER, “Berufung”, 8.

<sup>(23)</sup> HAACKER, “Berufung”, 10; S. KIM, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids 1981) 41-50.

<sup>(24)</sup> DONALDSON, “Zealot and Convert”, 673; see also T.L. DONALDSON, *Paul and the Gentiles. Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World* (Minneapolis 1997) 286.

<sup>(25)</sup> J. TAYLOR, “Why Did Paul Persecute the Church?”, *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (eds. G.N. STANTON and G.G. STROUMSA (Cambridge 1998) 110.

considers the Zealots to have been aggressive already against Jesus and his teachings; Jesus might have been to the zealots a “no-less-dangerous quietist, hardly better than a collaborator and a traitor”<sup>(26)</sup>. Paul’s persecutions were of the same kind as the Zealots’ political struggles; “he persecuted the followers of Jesus for the same kinds of reasons that Zealots had to be hostile to Jesus himself, namely that not only did they not take part in the national struggle . . . but they were a threat to it”<sup>(27)</sup>. As no one else, Taylor has here set Paul squarely among the violent political ‘Zealots’, even designating him as a follower of the ‘Fourth Philosophy’, persecuting because of zeal those who stood apart from the national struggle<sup>(28)</sup>.

The last scholar to be mentioned here, M.R. Fairchild<sup>(29)</sup>, follows Horsley in arguing that we cannot continue to consider the zealots as a unified group or sect with a distinctive theology and a continuous leadership extending from the Maccabees to the end of the Great War (66-70 CE). Nevertheless, following Hengel, contra Horsley, he finds that there does seem to have been a zealotic ideology that was cultivated over the decades from the time of the Maccabees to the War. This ideology had adherents in various groups, even among the Essenes (as stated by Hippolyt, *Refutatio* 9,21), and was occasionally displayed in violent actions against Torah transgressors. In Gal 1,13-14 and Phil 3,5-6 Paul “makes his association with the Zealot movement clear”<sup>(30)</sup>, even claiming to be a radical zealot, exceeding his Pharisaic contemporaries<sup>(31)</sup>. Fairchild has several pertinent observations. It is important that he finds it possible to call Paul a zealot without thereby associating him with a zealotic party. I suggest we will find such a view corroborated if we draw upon the writings of Philo in our considerations.

<sup>(26)</sup> TAYLOR, “Why Did Paul Persecute the Church?”, 108.

<sup>(27)</sup> TAYLOR, “Why Did Paul Persecute the Church?”, 110.

<sup>(28)</sup> HENGEL himself would hardly support such a view. See HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 180; cf. also M. HENGEL, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London 1991) 70-71: “... does not mean that the Pharisaic Jew was closely connected with the ‘Zealot’ movement of Judas of Galilee, but it does mean that for God’s cause and for the hallowing of the law he was prepared to use force if necessary, even to the point of killing the lawbreaker.” So also K.-W. NIEBUHR, *Heidenapostel aus Israel. Die jüdische Identität des Paulus nach ihrer Darstellung in seinen Briefen* (WUNT 62; Tübingen 1992) 26-29.

<sup>(29)</sup> FAIRCHILD, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Zealot Associations”.

<sup>(30)</sup> FAIRCHILD, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Zealot Associations”, 527.

<sup>(31)</sup> Cf. here also N.T. WRIGHT, “Paul, Arabia, and Elijah (Galatians 1:17)”, *JBL* 115 (1996) 683-692, especially p. 685.

### 5. *Some preliminary conclusions*

The three paradigms outlined above concerning the zealots remain, and so do their influence on studies of the zeal of Paul. The theory of Hengel has, however, lost some of its impact as a general paradigm for understanding the zeal in vogue in the decades between Judas the Galilean and the Great War. Horsley's emphases on sociological theories and models have made the variety of the many groups of this period come into clearer focus. His neglect of the importance of the zeal for God/the Torah, however, seems to be overdue skeptical. The texts about the role of such zeal are too many to be overlooked. Furthermore, the view of Smith and Morin still deserves further consideration. Hence the issue of the nature of the zealots of the pre-war times remains. And so does the question of the zeal of the pre-Christian Paul. In the following we will investigate how the issue of zeal in the works of Philo can offer new light on the nature of the zeal of the young persecutor Saul of Tarsus.

## II. Fresh Light on Gal 1,13-14 from the Works of Philo of Alexandria

There is not much scholarly literature to be found dealing with zeal and zealotry in the works of Philo. But the term ζῆλος and/or its derived forms are used several times in both Philo's *Exposition* and in his allegorical works<sup>(32)</sup>. A. Stumpf asserts that "Philo uses ζῆλος exclusively in connection with praiseworthy qualities, in the sense of 'striving after things.' He thus belongs to the sphere of Gk. ethics"<sup>(33)</sup>. M. Hengel states, however, that

ζηλωτής is used predominately in Greek literature in the pedagogical and moral sense. Hellenized Jewish authors are no exception to this general rule. The affective emphasis is no less in the employment of the concept. As we shall see later . . . this emphasis is the distinctive characteristic of the specifically Jewish use of the term. There is no

<sup>(32)</sup>In the works of Philo, ζῆλος is used 27 times, the verb ζηλόω 35 times, and the term ζηλωτής 16 times. That would make a total of 78, but the number of passages is in fact somewhat smaller, since the terms are in several instances combined.

<sup>(33)</sup>STUMPF, ζῆλος, *TDNT* II, 879. This view is somewhat uncritically adopted in the related article in *DNTT* III, 1166: "The concept of striving for ethical perfection — the only use found in Philo (cf. *Deus Imm.* 60f; *TDNT* II, 879f) — does not appear" [in OT].



equivalent in the Greek world and it can only be understood in the religious perspective <sup>(34)</sup>.

When we consider the terms ζήλος, ζηλόω, and ζηλωτής together, it becomes evident that the view of Hengel is basically correct when it comes to the writings of Philo. In the works of Philo, ζήλος can be used in both a positive and a negative sense, depending on the objects associated with the concept. There is a ζήλος that is good, and to be striven after, and there is a bad one which is to be avoided.

### 1. *The violent zeal of Spec. 1,54-57 and 2,252-254*

The most important texts in the works of Philo dealing with the violent zeal according to the model of Phinehas are *Spec.* 1,54-57 and 2,252-254 <sup>(35)</sup>. The whole passage of 1,54-57 is part of Philo's exposition of the first two Commandments of the Decalogue (cf. *Spec.* 1,12 and 2,1), drawing on the episode of Phinehas to legitimate actions against the transgressors <sup>(36)</sup>. This text segment is thus to be regarded

<sup>(34)</sup> HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 62.

<sup>(35)</sup> In the following exposition of these two passages I draw on my study of *Establishment Violence in Philo and Luke*. I am grateful to the publishers E.J. Brill for permission to use material from this work. For a more comprehensive exegesis of these texts, see SELAND, *Establishment Violence*, 103-181. There is, however, nothing about Saul/Paul as a zealot in that work.

<sup>(36)</sup> The text runs: "54But if any member of the nation betray the honor due to the One they should suffer the utmost penalties. They have abandoned their most vital duty, their service in the ranks of piety and religion, have chosen darkness in preference to the brightest light and blindfolded the mind which had the power of keen vision. 55And it is well that all who have a zeal for virtue should be permitted to exact the penalties offhand and with no delay, without bringing the offender before jury or council or any kind of magistrate at all, and give full scope to the feelings which possess them, that hatred of evil and love of God which urges them to inflict punishment without mercy on the impious. They should think that the occasion has made them councillors, jurymen, high sheriffs, members of assembly, accusers, witnesses, laws, people, everything in fact, so that without fear or hindrance they might champion religion in full security. 56There is recorded in the Laws the example of one who acted with this admirable courage. He had seen some persons consorting with foreign women and through attraction of their love-charms spurning their ancestral customs and seeking admission to the rites of a fabulous religion. One in particular he saw, the chief ringleader of the backsliding, who had the audacity to exhibit his unholy conduct in public and was openly offering sacrifices, a travesty of the name, to images of wood and stone in the presence of the whole people. So, seized with inspired fury, keeping back the throng of spectators on either side, he slew without qualm him and her, the man because he listened to lessons which it were a gain to unlearn, the woman because

as a part of an actualizing exposition of these commandments which are considered the most prominent among the ten in the Decalogue (*Dec.* 65)<sup>(37)</sup>. Philo's use of ζῆλος is here of great significance. Since 1,55 is followed up in 1,56 by a clear reference to the Phinehas episode of Num 25, it is most reasonable to take the function of ζῆλος in 1.55 as another reference to the ζῆλος of Phinehas, as stated in that OT passage. There should thus be little doubt that Num 25 is the basis for Philo's expositions in 1.55ff.

In *Spec.* 2,252-253 Philo deals with the issue of perjury, and states that such a crime will not go unpunished by God even if the culprit evades the chastisement of men; but he will never escape from men either, as there are thousands who are full of zeal for the laws, merciless to those who do anything to subvert them<sup>(38)</sup>. His statements about the concerns of the 'zealots' might also be read, moreover, as signifying that, with regard to its effects, the crime was to be characterized as a subversion of 'the laws,' of 'the ancient institutions' (2,253b: τῶν πατρίων).

In order to understand the seriousness of Philo's view of this crime, one should also draw on his characterizations of the concerns of those ready to take action. While ζηλωταὶ νόμων is obviously a reference to those zealous for the Commandments of the Torah, the expression τῶν πατρίων is to be read as an abbreviation of τῶν

---

she had been the instructor in wickedness. The deed suddenly wrought in the heat of excitement acted as a warning to multitudes who were preparing to make the same apostasy....".

<sup>(37)</sup>F.H. Colson surmises in a footnote to his edition of this text that Deut 13,12-18 and 17,6 are here alluded to, but there is no detectable quotation nor any clear allusion to these Deuteronomic texts in this passage. See *Philo* (LCL; London 1929-1953) VII, 130 and 616-618. This mistake recurs in W. HORBURY, "1 Thessalonians II,3 as Rebutting the Charge of False Prophecy", *JTS* 33 (1982) 493, and in G.R. STERLINGS review of my *Establishment Violence*, see *JBL* 116 (1997) 368-370.

<sup>(38)</sup>The full text runs: 252 For persons who call God to witness to an untruth, death is the appointed punishment, quite rightly. For not even a man, if he is of a decent sort, will tolerate an invitation to join in subscribing to an untruth, but would in my opinion regard anyone who urged him to this course as an enemy unfit to be trusted. 253 And therefore we must declare that God, though His nature is to be merciful, will never free from guilt him who swears falsely to an injustice, a miscreant almost beyond possibility of purification, even if he evades the chastisements of men. And these he will never escape; for there are thousands who have their eyes upon him full of zeal for the laws (ζηλωταὶ νόμων), strictest guardians of the ancestral institutions (φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι), merciless to those who do anything to subvert them....

πατρίων ἐθῶν<sup>(39)</sup>, an expression which is found in several other Jewish works<sup>(40)</sup>. We shall return to these issues below in our exposition of Gal 1,13-14.

Hence we now turn to the question of the zeal of the young Saul of Tarsus. For the sake of brevity and concentration, we will stick to Gal 1,13-14, focusing especially the *characterizations* of Saul/Paul and his actions presented there. The other passages related to his zeal will be drawn upon when relevant. Let us have a closer reading at three particular characterizations of Paul in Gal 1,13-14, and have a fresh look at them in light of how Philo understands the similar aspects in *Spec.* 1,54-57 and 2,252-253.

## 2. περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων

When Paul describes himself here as ζηλωτής, he uses a characterization that is rather close to Phil 3,6 where he states that he persecuted the church κατὰ ζῆλος, a self-characterization corroborated by Acts 22,3. The term ζηλωτής is most often translated as “zealous”, but grammatically it is a noun, and could as well be translated “zealot”<sup>(41)</sup>. Anyway, Paul here explicitly describes his violent actions against the Christians as closely related to his zeal. Let us return to how Philo describes the violent zealots of *Spec.* 1,54-57 and 2,252-3.

The persons to take action against the transgressors are described in *Spec.* 1,55 thus: “And it is well that all who have a zeal for virtue (ἅπανσι τοῖς ζῆλον ἔχουσιν ἀρετῆς) should be permitted to exact the penalties offhand and with no delay.” Then, having stated that they should not bring the offender before any jury, etc., Philo characterizes them thus: They should “give full scope to the feelings which possess them, that hatred of evil and love of God which urge them to inflict punishment without mercy on the impious.” This characterization receives a further specification in 1,56-57, where the Phinehas episode is used as a legitimating example.

The affective and violent nature of this ζῆλος is indicated by

<sup>(39)</sup> See *Mosis* 2,193; *Spec.* 2,148; *Praem.* 106; *Flacc.* 43. 52. 53; *Legat.* 170.300; *Hypoth.* 7,11.

<sup>(40)</sup> See *Ant.* 14,227.258.260; 19.290; and Acts 15,1; 21,21; 26,3; 28,17 et al. See also W.C. VAN UNNIK, “Die Anklage gegen die Apostel in Philippi”, *Sparsa Collecta Part One* (NTS; Leiden 1973) 374-85; S.G. WILSON, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS 50; Cambridge 1983) 1-11.

<sup>(41)</sup> This is especially emphasized by FAIRCHILD, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Zealot Associations”, 530-531.

several features. The expression νομίσαντας of 1,55 ('they should think that the occasion has made them councillors etc...') represents an aspect having some parallels in other texts related to the issue of self-redress and lynching. In *Spec.* 1,316 (on Deut 13) it is said that those who would rush to take vengeance on the unholy seducer would do so κρίνοντες εὐαγὲς τὸ κατ' αὐτοῦ φονᾶν ("deem it a religious duty to seek his death"). A similar statement is given in *Spec.* 3,96, which deals with the measures to be taken against μάγοι and φαρμακευταί: "And therefore it is right that even the most reasonable and mild-tempered should seek the blood of these, that they should lose hardly a moment in becoming their executioners, and should *hold it a religious duty* to keep their punishment in their own hands and not commit it to others (καὶ νομίσαντας εὐαγὲς εἶναι τὸ μὴ ἑτέροις τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐπιτρέπειν ἄλλ' ἑαυτοῖς)". Similar sayings are also to be found in Philo's retelling of the Levites' action in the desert (*Spec.* 3,26) and of Moses' killing the Egyptian (*Mosis* 1,44). Accordingly, there are cases where it is right to kill on the spot a violator of the Torah. And such an action should be deemed holy, as "a religious duty" (*Spec.* 3,128, cf. John 16,1-4). These aspects surely point to features of "affective emphasis" among the agents thus described. Furthermore, in 1,55 this aspect is described thus: They should "give full scope to the feelings which possess them, that hatred of evil and love of God which urges them to inflict punishment without mercy on the impious (ἀλλὰ τῷ παραστάντι μισοπονήρῳ πάθει καὶ φιλοθέῳ καταχρῆσθαι πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀπαραιτήτους κολάσεις)". Here this comes as an explanation of their zeal and is in accordance with *Spec.* 4,14, where Philo says that "everyone who is inspired with zeal for virtue (ζήλος ἀρετῆς), is severe of temper and absolutely implacable against manstealers." The same emotional aspect is followed up by the injunction to exact the penalties "offhand and with no delay"<sup>(42)</sup> and "without fear or hindrance" (*Spec.* 3,96), and by the statement that the punishment is to be inflicted "without mercy" on the impious. The expression here translated "without mercy," i.e., the Greek term ἀπαράιτητος, meaning "inexorable," "inevitable," "not to

<sup>(42)</sup> See the expression ἐκ χειρός ("offhand") as an expression denoting killing on the spot. In *Spec.* 3,91 and 4,10 Philo uses αὐτοχειρία ("with his own hand"). But this could as well be translated 'on the spot' or 'offhand.' Cf. also *Ebr.* 66; *Mosis* 1,303.308; *Spec.* 3,96. The expression probably has a primary meaning of "by one's own hands," but in several contexts this would also seem also to imply "offhand", "in a hurry", "on the spot."

be turned away with prayer,” signifies the absence of mercy in several descriptions of punishment for specific severe crimes<sup>(43)</sup>.

Hence we have here not only a case where Philo admonishes zealous persons to take action, but one in which he also explicitly points to their feelings of anger and suggests a rapid and violent action on the spot. His further specifications emphasize the “affective nature” of this zeal, a feature corroborated by his reference to the Phinehas episode. Furthermore, as they are told not to bring the offender before any court, the persons denoted are not to be restricted to court officials, or any other known group formations, but any zealous Jew might take such actions.

In the other text, *Spec.* 2,252-3, Philo gives a similar description of the violent zealots present: “there are ‘thousands’ *present* full of zeal for the laws (ζηλωταὶ νόμων), strictest guardians of the ancestral institutions (φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι), merciless to those who do anything to subvert them” (*Spec.* 2,253). The latter text is thus much closer to a report than the other. This special feature enhances its importance for the present study.

The description of the agents supposed to take violent measures against the perjurers is rather brief, but it nevertheless contains two aspects warranting further comment: the expression ζηλωταὶ νόμων and φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι.

The expression ζηλωταὶ νόμων is a hapax legomenon in the works of Philo. Philo seems to prefer the term ἀρετή as denoting the object for ζῆλος. There need be no contradiction here, however, as the Law according to Philo, is a central “instrument” in acquiring virtue (ἀρετή)<sup>(44)</sup>. Nevertheless, the expression ζηλωταὶ νόμων remains important. This expression is first attested in 1 Macc 2,26.27.50 and 58<sup>(45)</sup>, where it takes the place of “zeal for God,” a change due to the

<sup>(43)</sup> See *Legat.* 305; *Ebr.* 3.135 on the case of priests entering the holy of holies, *Legat.* 212 on Gentiles entering the Temple, *Spec.* 3,76 on sexual intercourse with a betrothed girl and 4,19 on manstealers. Cf. further on those imitating Phinehas at Sittim (Num 25): *Mosis* 1,303, on the anger of Gaius Caligula: *Legat.* 192 and 244, and lastly of the wrath of God: *Gig.* 47; *Deus* 48,68; *Ebr.* 116.

<sup>(44)</sup> In *Praem.* 162 the Commandments are described as “the holy laws of justice and piety;” in *Spec.* 1,299 they are “injunctions to piety,” a function most clearly set forth in *Spec.* 4,134: “For each of the ten pronouncements separately and all in common incites and exhorts us to wisdom and justice and godliness and the rest of the company of the virtues.” Hence zeal for the laws is thus also zeal for virtue.

<sup>(45)</sup> Cf. HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 149-154.

prominent place of the Law in post-exilic Judaism. It is not found in the works of Josephus; the closest parallel in his works is *Ant.* 12,271 where Mattathias' call (1 Macc 2,26) *πᾶς ὁ ζηλῶν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ...* is rendered as *εἴ τις ζηλωτής ἐστιν τῶν πατρίων ἐθῶν καὶ* (<sup>46</sup>). The zeal concerned in Philo's texts associated with violent measures against non-conformers is related to its Jewish context both by the stress on its "Affektbetontheit" (1,55) and here by its association with "the laws."

These observations of the role of zeal for God/Torah in Philo's works substantiate the rather casual remark by K. Haacker that some astonishing zealotic sayings are to be found in the works of Philo of Alexandria: "Das lehrt im Blick auf Paulus, dass geographische Gesichtspunkte (Tarsus) und das Vorhandensein hellenistischer Bildungselemente nicht gegen die Annahme zelotischer Einflüsse ins Feld geführt werden können" (<sup>47</sup>). G. Alon has suggested that Philo used a Halachic tradition, and that "Philo did not teach this Halakha of his own record, but on the basis of an ancient Halachic tradition that he knew, and which was acted upon in Eretz-Israel and in the Diaspora in Philo's days" (<sup>48</sup>). Alon finds his view further substantiated by texts as 1 Macc 1,24; 3 Macc 7,10-15, and several New Testament and Rabbinic texts (<sup>49</sup>). Be that as it may (<sup>50</sup>), the conclusion remains that the works of Philo should not be overlooked when considering the impact of zeal for God/Torah in the first century CE, and the role such zeal might have had in the early life of Paul.

The pervasiveness of this kind of zealotic attitudes can be further substantiated by considering the second part of the relevant phrase of Gal 1,14.

(<sup>46</sup>) See *ibid.*, 154-155. Cf. also *Ant.* 20,41 (*ζηλοῦν τὰ πατρία τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), and *C. Apion* 2:286, where *τοὺς νόμους* is inherent.

(<sup>47</sup>) HAACKER, "Berufung", 9, note 38; MORIN, "Les deux derniers des douze: Simon le zélote et Judas Isakariôth", 341.

(<sup>48</sup>) G. ALON, "On Philo's Halakha", *The Jews, Judaism and the Classical World* (Jerusalem 1977) 114.

(<sup>49</sup>) See especially Acts 6-8; 9,23-24; 23,12-15; m. San 9,6; *Jubilees* 30,7.14-15 and b. San 8b; 80b and m. San 4,4. See on this also the older work of J. JUSTER, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain. Leurs condition juridique, économique et sociale* (Paris 1914) I, 157.

(<sup>50</sup>) Morin states that several texts of Philo describe the zealots in a remarkably similar way to the Mishnah; MORIN, "Les deux derniers des douze: Simon le zélote et Judas Isakariôth", 341. See further SELAND, *Establishment Violence*, 67-72, 130-131, 181.

### 3. περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν παραδόσεων

In view of the expression in Gal 1,14 of Paul as having been ζηλωτής ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων, the almost identical passage from *Spec.* 2,253 (μυρίοι γὰρ ἔφοροι, ζηλωταὶ νόμων, φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι) should be especially interesting.

This latter characterization, φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι, has occasioned some discussion. First, τῶν πατρίων is most probably an abbreviation for τῶν πατρίων ἔθων, since an additional νομῶν would constitute tautology. Second, it has been discussed whether Philo by this term in general means the oral Law as contrasted with the written. I. Heinemann, in an influential study from 1927, strongly argues that it has no such denotation at all, but is to be understood in the light of the Greek conception of ἄγραφος νόμος as “a law not given by men or by god, but one that exists like nature”<sup>(51)</sup>, demonstrating that Philo knew nothing about the Palestinian division between oral and written Torah. I. Heinemann seems to be too one-sided, however, in his preference for the Greek background and content of this term in Philo’s works. While the terminology owes most to his Greek-Hellenistic context, its content is more Jewish than Heinemann was willing to acknowledge<sup>(52)</sup>.

When reading Philo, we find that the term ἔθος (‘custom’) is used in various contexts: it may denote foreign customs (*Somn.* 2,56; *Spec.* 3,13; *Ebr.* 193; *Jos.* 29) or customs which may be viewed as superstitious (*Virt.* 218-219; *Congr.* 85; *Spec.* 3,29). For his evaluation and understanding of Jewish customs, *Spec.* 4,149; *Migr.* 89-90; and *Legat.* 115-116 and 210 are important. In the first passage it is stated that “customs are unwritten laws, the decisions approved by men of old, not inscribed on monuments nor on leaves of paper which the moth destroys, but on the souls of those who are partners in the same citizenship,” and it is stated that both the written laws and the customs are to be obeyed. In *Legat.* 115 it is said that the Jews are trained by both sacred laws and unwritten customs “to acknowledge one God who is the Father and Maker of the world,” and the importance of

<sup>(51)</sup> I. HEINEMANN, “Die Lehre vom ungeschriebenen Gesetz im jüdischen Schrifttum”, *HUCA* 4 (1927) 149-71; E.E. URBACH, *The Sages. Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Cambridge, MASS. 1987) 291.

<sup>(52)</sup> See B. SCHRÖDER, *Die ‘väterlichen Gesetze’*. Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer (TU 53; Tübingen 1996).

observing the customs as well as the Laws is stressed in *Migr.* 89-93<sup>(53)</sup>.

There are also sayings of Philo in which the Torah and customs are almost identified (*Legat.* 210), or where commandments are described as customs<sup>(54)</sup>. “It would thus appear that on occasions the distinction between customs and law collapses, especially in contexts where Philo defends a particular Jewish practice, or Jewish customs in general”<sup>(55)</sup>. The expression “the customs (of the fathers)” (cf. τῶν πατρίων [ἐθῶν]) is especially frequent in Philo’s political and apologetical works *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*<sup>(56)</sup>. This observation strongly supports the suggestion that it was a term of great political and constitutional importance<sup>(57)</sup>. Thus it is to be interpreted in light of Jewish conceptions of their constitution. Hence the expressions in *Spec.* 2,253 are important: they are strong expressions, denoting that what was at stake is the basis of Judaism, its constitution<sup>(58)</sup>.

The expression focused here becomes even more interesting for understanding Paul when we consider the words of *Spec.* 2,253; the saying of Mattathias in Josephus’ *Ant.* 12,271; and Gal 1,14 together:

*Spec.* 2,253: μυρίοι γὰρ ἔφοροι, ζηλωταὶ νόμων, φύλακες τῶν πατρίων ἀκριβέστατοι

*Ant.* 12,271: εἴ τις ζηλωτὴς ἐστὶν τῶν πατρίων ἐθῶν

Gal 1,14: περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων

<sup>(53)</sup> See *Migr.* 90b: “These men are taught by the sacred word to have thought for good repute, and let nothing that is part of the customs fixed by divinely empowered men greater than those of our time” (καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσι λύειν). S. BELKIN, *Philo and the Oral Law* (HSS 11; Cambridge 1968) 30, sees this expression as denoting Palestinian oral traditions.

<sup>(54)</sup> *Spec.* 1,3: circumcision; *Spec.* 2,148: passover; *Mosis* 1,87: sacrifices. See WILSON, *Luke and the Law*, 6.

<sup>(55)</sup> WILSON, *Luke and the Law*, 6.

<sup>(56)</sup> See *Flacc.* 41. 43. 48.50.52.53.75.79.81.116.154; *Legat.* 81.89.115.116. 134.161.164.170.201.210.240. 268.300.356.360. Cf. also *Hypoth.* 6,9; 7,6.10 and 11.

<sup>(57)</sup> See M. KLINGHARDT, *Gesetz und Volk Gottes*. Das lukanische Verständnis des Gesetzes nach Herkunft, Funktion und seinem Ort in der Geschichte des Urchristentums (WUNT; Tübingen 1988) 119: “der Begriff väterliche Gesetze/Sitten weniger ein religiöser Begriff war, als vielmehr ein politischer: Väterliche Gesetze/Sitten sind nicht einfach deskriptiv die Beschreibung des Überlieferten, sondern dienen normativ der Legitimation autonomer Bürger zur Selbstverwaltung durch die Tradition”.

<sup>(58)</sup> On the political aspects of these expressions, see also H.G. KIPPENBERG, “Die jüdische Überlieferungen als patrioi nomoi”, *Die Restauration der Götter* (eds. R. FABER – R. SCHLESIER) (Würzburg 1986) 45-60.



The same use as found in Philo is thus also present in Josephus' works. Here the term ἔθος in passages related to Jewish contexts seems to denote primarily the customs characteristic of the Jews, i.e., those that distinguish them from other peoples<sup>(59)</sup>. The term is also one of the several synonyms for the Law both in Josephus' works<sup>(60)</sup> as well as in the Lukan texts in the New Testament<sup>(61)</sup>. How is this in Paul? Scholars are somewhat divided with regard to the question if Paul here in Gal 1 means only the traditions of the elders, i.e., the oral Torah<sup>(62)</sup>, or if he means the Torah, both oral and written<sup>(63)</sup>. The Letter to the Galatians was written, however, to communities constituted by Gentiles. To them the phrase 'ancestral traditions' would most probably have connoted the Mosaic Law, possibly also oral legal traditions, but would not have excluded the Torah itself<sup>(64)</sup>. In light of the use of these terms in the Diaspora works of Philo and Josephus, this interpretation is strengthened. Furthermore, Paul himself is here using this expression as evidence for his great progression in 'Judaism'<sup>(65)</sup>, even surpassing all others of his own age at that time. His zealous persecution of the early Christians as evidence for his Law-observance is corroborated by Phil 3,6 too. Hence Paul's expression probably denotes the Torah, both oral and written as handed over to him from his pharisaic fathers, i.e. his teachers.

The role of the early Maccabees in the history of the Phinehas-traditions of violent zeal for God/Torah is hardly to be denied<sup>(66)</sup>, and the similarity of the terminology of Gal 1,14 with both *Ant.* 12,217 and *Spec.* 2,253 is so great that it is hardly to be considered a coincidence.

<sup>(59)</sup> See KLINGHARDT, *Gesetz und Volk Gottes*, 116-120.

<sup>(60)</sup> WILSON, *Luke and the Law*; KLINGHARDT, *Gesetz und Volk Gottes*, 116.

<sup>(61)</sup> WILSON, *Luke and the Law*, 1-4; KLINGHARDT, *Gesetz und Volk Gottes*, 115.

<sup>(62)</sup> See e.g., H. SCHLIER, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KKNT; Göttingen 1961) 51-52; F.F. BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NIGTC; Exeter 1982) 91.

<sup>(63)</sup> Cf. e.g., H.D. BETZ, *Galatians*. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1979) 45,138; B. WITHERINGTON III, *Grace in Galatia*. A Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Galatians (Edinburgh 1997) 104; J.L. MARTYN, *Galatians*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 33A, New York 1998) 155,163. Probably also NIEBUHR, *Heidenapostel aus Israel*, 30-35.

<sup>(64)</sup> WITHERINGTON III, *Grace in Galatia*, 104.

<sup>(65)</sup> Cf. his expressions τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ (1,13), and προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ (1,14).

<sup>(66)</sup> FARMER, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus*; W.R. FARMER, "Zealot", *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* (New York 1962) 936-39; HENGEL, *The Zealots*, 149-156.

It represents a tradition of how to characterize violent zeal. Hence Paul is here aligning himself with predecessors of venerable individual ‘zealots’<sup>(67)</sup>. This does not, however, make him a member of a zealot ‘movement’ or ‘party’<sup>(68)</sup>. But he saw himself as acting out the model of Phinehas, being zealous for the Law, even to the extent of using violence against overt perpetrators, thus becoming a persecutor of the early Christians<sup>(69)</sup>. We shall elaborate a little on the issue of the severity of Paul’s zeal in the next section.

4. ὅτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν

The verb διώκειν does not by itself denote violent actions; it may be used in the sense of ‘pursue’ or even ‘follow’. But it may also denote ‘persecute’, and the contexts thus become important to determine the more exact meaning of the expressions concerned.

When it comes to the expressions used in Philo’s *Spec.* 1,54-57 and 2,252-3, there is little doubt that the punishments he considers to be carried out by the zealots on the spot are violent death. In *Spec.* 1,54, the measures to be enforced is stated very briefly: “They should suffer the utmost penalties” (ταῖς ἀνωτάτω τιμωρίαις ὀφείλουσι κολάζεσθαι). This expression is very short, but it is most probable that the punishment it signifies is death. This interpretation can be supported by several observations: first, by the expression ταῖς ἀνωτάτω τιμωρίαις as used in other Philonic texts<sup>(70)</sup>, then by the description of the practice and legitimation which follow in 1,55-57<sup>(71)</sup>, and lastly from the description of the capital punishment to be

<sup>(67)</sup> Fairchild suggests that Paul’s terminology makes his association with the Zealot movement clear, but as there most probably was no zealot ‘movement’ at this time, this is an overstatement. See FAIRCHILD, “Paul’s Pre-Christian Zealot Associations”, 527, and TAYLOR, “Why Did Paul Persecute the Church?”.

<sup>(68)</sup> So also DONALDSON, “Zealot and Convert”, 673. For a zealot-interpretation, see TAYLOR, “Why Did Paul Persecute the Church?”.

<sup>(69)</sup> HENGEL, *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 70-71; J. DUPONT, “The Conversion of Paul, and Its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by Faith”, *Apostolic History and the Gospel*. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. BRUCE on His 60th Birthday (eds. W.W. GASQUE – R.P. MARTIN) (Exeter 1970) esp. 183-87; WRIGHT, “Paul, Arabia, and Elijah (Galatians 1:17)”, 686.

<sup>(70)</sup> Cf. *Mosis* 2,204; *Spec.* 3,53-62; *Legat.* 59.

<sup>(71)</sup> Here Philo uses the Phinehas episode as a legitimating example. If this example should have any value, it must represent the same kind of punishment as that denoted by the expression ταῖς ἀνωτάτω τιμωρίαις.

inflicted on the transgressors of the first five Commandments, as stated in *Spec.* 2,242. Here the judgment of death is stated for violating each of the first five Commandments, and this severe punishment is here further argued for by reference to the honorable role of Israel in the world, i.e., by his emphasis on the great significance and responsibility of belonging to the people of God.

Concerning the punishment to be inflicted according to 2,252, this is given already in its opening statement: "For persons who call God to witness to an untruth, death is the appointed punishment" (ὥρισται δίκη θανάτου). One ought probably to include 2,253 too: "God, though his nature is to be merciful, will never free from guilt him who swears falsely to an injustice, a miscreant almost beyond possibility of purification, even if he evades the chastisements of men." Hence the following conclusions can be drawn: the relevant punishment is death. This is to be carried out by humans, but if anyone should manage to escape the hands of men, he/she will not escape God: he/she will for ever be considered as impure.

Returning to Gal 1,14, Paul does not only say that he was 'zealous' and persecuted, but he clothes his statements in expressions that emphasize the intensity and severity of his attitudes and actions. In Galatians he uses the verb διώκειν both in descriptions of his own persecutions (Gal 1,13-23; cf. 1 Cor 15,9; Phil 3,6), as well as the persecutions he himself suffered (Gal 4,29; 5,11; 6,12; cf. 1 Cor 4,12; 2 Cor 4,9). This verb is, however, somewhat ambiguous. In a much cited article Ph. Menoud has suggested that in Galatians 1,13.23 Paul used the πορθεῖν in a "sens morale", denoting that Paul tried to destroy the faith of the Christians<sup>(72)</sup>. D.R.A. Hare followed this up by stating that "From what we know of his character and abilities it seems highly probable that his activity was primarily verbal", representing something like 'annoy' and 'harass verbally'<sup>(73)</sup>. Others have strongly opposed such a reading<sup>(74)</sup>.

<sup>(72)</sup> P.H. MENOUD, "Le Sens du verbe πορθεῖν", in *APOPHORETA*. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen (BZNW 3; Berlin 1964) 178-186.

<sup>(73)</sup> Cf. D.R.A. HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution* (SNTSMS; Cambridge 1967) 59-60; E. BAASLAND, "Persecution: A Neglected Feature in the Letter to the Galatians", *ST* 38 (1984) 136-137; B. WANDER, *Trennungsprozesse zwischen frühem Christentum und Judentum in 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Datierbare Abfolgen zwischen der Hinrichtung Jesu und der Zerstörung des Jerusalemer Tempels (TANZ 16; Tübingen 1995) 150.

<sup>(74)</sup> Few have been so emphatic as DERRETT, calling Hare's view

The verb διώκω is used in the pres.part. in Gal 1,23, and in the imperfect in 1,13. The only verb directly associated with καί is πορθεῖν, both times in the imperfect tense. It is difficult to decide if καί is used paratactically or explicatively in 1,13 as both verbs are in the imperfect. Considering the aspect, both verbs can be read as durative; many, but not all, take πορθεῖν in 1,13 as ‘de conatu’<sup>(75)</sup>, an interpretation that can also be seen in various Bible translations, e.g., in the Norwegian and English editions. Reading 1,13 and 1,23 together supports the understanding that καί is explicative; the persecutions consisted of πορθεῖν. The meaning of this verb is lexicalized as ‘destroy’, denoting violent action, of making havoc of, annihilate, ruining e.g., cities<sup>(76)</sup>. Combined with the other verb discussed above, it most probably means much more than sharp polemical discussion, verbal harassment, etc. Furthermore, it is also difficult to read it “au sens morale” if it shall qualify διωκεῖν, a term already strengthened by his καθ’ ὑπερβολήν<sup>(77)</sup>. In fact, Paul should have little need in exaggerating his former activities as a persecutor, they already knew about his former life (1,13: Ἐκούσατε γάρ ..., cf. 1,20). His statements then, should be read as denoting violent measures beyond trying to destroy ‘the faith’<sup>(78)</sup>. As a youngster, he was “extremely zealous” (περισσοτέρως ζηλωτής 1,14), While we have no evidence in his letters that he persecuted “into death” (compare Acts 22,4), the violent zealous nature of his persecutions should not be under-interpreted. The evidence of Philo, as well as the zealous activities of the various “revolutionary” groups in Palestine in Paul’s times, provide a cultural context for understanding horrifying persecutions even if they did not always result in death. The early ‘Christians’ is described in our sources as suffering zealous persecutions almost from the very beginnings of their existence<sup>(79)</sup>.

---

“whitewashing”, see J.D.M. DERRETT, “Cursing Jesus (I Cor XII.2): The Jews as Religious ‘Persecutors’”, *NTS* 21 (1975) 545 note 3.

<sup>(75)</sup> Cf. F. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief* (HTKNT; Freiburg 1977) 78-80; BETZ, *Galatians*, 57. Read as primarily durative, see BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 89-91.

<sup>(76)</sup> HENGEL, *The Pre-Christian Paul*, 71-72.

<sup>(77)</sup> Cf. its emphasizing role in Rom 7,13; 1 Cor 12,31; 2 Cor 1,8; 4,17.

<sup>(78)</sup> See also WITHERINGTON III, *Grace in Galatia*, 100. Contra MENOUD, “Le Sens du verbe πορθεῖν”.

<sup>(79)</sup> L.W. HURTADO, “Pre-70 CE Jewish Opposition to Christ-Devotion”, *JTS* 50 (1999) 35-58.

### III. Saul as a zealous persecutor; some plausible conclusions

Considering Paul's activities as a persecutor in light of the material of Philo worked out above, and the history of the violent and somewhat "revolutionary" actions and groups present in Palestine in the decades up to and during the Great War, we might draw several plausible conclusions.

*First*, the material concerned does not support the view that Paul is to be considered a member of a group or movement to be called the Zealots. The evidence from Philo does not point to the existence of any such groups, but informs us about individual zealous persons, ready to take actions against overt transgressors of the Torah, especially blasphemy, idolatry, false prophets seducing people into apostasy (*Spec.* 1,315-318)<sup>(80)</sup>, and perjury. Such persons could be present in courts; but they were not to be identified as court personnel, but could be present everywhere. Philo's descriptions of such persons seem to indicate that they did not represent any definable or consistent group-formation, but point to persons taking zealous actions on the spot because of violations of the Torah. Furthermore, since here a special understanding and interpretation of the Torah is applied, this phenomenon should not be characterized as a movement, but rather as a tendency or trajectory of zealous interpretation, present as a latent possibility of legitimation. Such interpretation was contemporized and realized in certain circumstances of gross Torah transgressions both in the Diaspora and in Palestine. This interpretation makes sense of the Philonic texts, but it is also stimulating for understanding the material related to Palestine.

*Secondly*, the material of Philo suggest that persons committing serious crimes as idolatry, apostasy, seduction, and perjury could be attacked by violent 'zealots'. Furthermore, such zealots were vigilant against persons considered to be attacking the Torah, the constitution so to speak, of the Jewish communities. How Paul considered the early Christians is not as clear as one might want it to be, but something can be said. By calling himself a 'zealot' (Gal 1,13.23, cf. Phil 3,6), Paul saw himself as acting out the model of Phinehas, purging (see Philo's *Mosis* 1,303: ἐκκαθαίρουσι, cf. Num 25,13; Ps 106,30-31; Sir 45,23) the defilement of the nation by punishing the supposed sinners. Hence Paul probably saw the Christians as dangerous and subverting, and his

<sup>(80)</sup> On this particular text, see SELAND, *Establishment Violence*, 136-160.

own actions as purifying. Donaldson and Hare have, better than most others, emphasized the sociological aspects of how the early Christians were perceived. The Judaisms at the time were generally tolerant; but to “strain the limits of tolerance with respect to Israel’s identifying symbols and boundary markers was to pose a socio-theological threat” ... Persecution arises not because a group holds ideas at variance with the norm, but because it does so in ways that threaten social cohesion”<sup>(81)</sup>. Paul most probably saw the early Christians as representing such a threat, and acted as a zealot, “trying to destroy” their groups (Gal 1,13.23). That such a violent behavior was both possible and plausible is further corroborated by Philo’s emphasis on considering such actions of reprisals ‘a religious duty’<sup>(82)</sup>. Such an attitude is also echoed in John 16,2 where a tradition is transmitted that Jesus warned his disciples that “the hour is coming when whoever kills you will think he is offering service to God”<sup>(83)</sup>.

Hence the evidence of fervent zeal present in the works of Philo as demonstrated in the present study is interesting for understanding zeal in the first century CE; as such it is also illuminating when considering the nature of the zeal of the young Saul’s persecutions of the early followers of Jesus of Nazareth.

Department of Religious Studies  
Volda University College  
PO Box 500. 6101 Volda (Norway)

Torrey SELAND

<sup>(81)</sup> DONALDSON, “Zealot and Convert”, 671; HARE, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 1-18.

<sup>(82)</sup> Cf. *Spec.* 1,316 (on Deut 13) where it is said that those who would rush to take vengeance on the unholy seducer would do so κρίνοντες εὐαγὲς τὸ κατ’ αὐτοῦ φονᾶν (“deem it a religious duty to seek his death”, cf. above).

<sup>(83)</sup> See on this text C.K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St John* (London 1978) 485-85; R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel of John I* (AB; New York 1966) 691-692; B. LINDARS, “The Persecution of Christians in John 15:18 - 16:4a”, *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament* (eds. W. HORBURY and B. MCNEIL) (Cambridge 1981) 48-69; D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John* (London 1991) 530-532. Carson even surmises concerning ‘offering a service to God’ that “Certainly that is how Paul analyzed his pre-Christian commitment to persecute the Church” (531).

## SUMMARY

One of the most consistent features in the portraits of Saul of Tarsus in the Acts of the Apostles and in the letters accredited to Paul, is the fervent zeal of his youth. The zeal of the young Saul has been dealt with in several studies, drawing on the issue of zealotry in Palestine, but the conclusions reached are rather diverse. The present study suggests that the often overlooked phenomenon of zealotry in the writings of Philo of Alexandria should also be considered. The material from Philo does not support the view that the early zealots formed any consistent movement or party, but that they were vigilant individuals who took the Law in their own hands when observing cases of gross Torah transgressions.

## **Qui me délivrera de ce corps de mort? L'Esprit de vie!** **Romains 7,24 et 8,2 comme éléments de typologie adamique**

Que les chapitres 5 à 8 de l'Épître aux Romains constituent une unité argumentative est un fait de plus en plus reconnu aujourd'hui<sup>(1)</sup>, même s'il ne l'est pas de manière générale<sup>(2)</sup>. Il contribue assurément à une lecture plus cohérente de cette lettre, ce que montrent plus particulièrement les travaux de J.-N. Aletti<sup>(3)</sup>.

Il propose, de cette section de l'épître, une organisation<sup>(4)</sup> qui nous semble bien rendre compte de la façon dont se développe l'argumentation paulinienne, organisation que l'on retrouvera en se reportant au tableau que nous avons fait figurer en conclusion de cet article.

La thèse qui est défendue est la suivante: «La Loi intervint pour qu'abondât la faute; mais, là où abonda le péché, a surabondé la grâce, afin que, comme a régné le péché dans la mort, ainsi aussi la grâce régnât par la justice, en vue de la vie éternelle, par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur» (5,20-21). De par sa formulation, cette *propositio* met en évidence les oppositions qui sont au cœur de la *probatio* (6,1-8,30) qui suit, oppositions entre Loi, péché et mort, d'une part, justification, grâce et vie éternelle, de l'autre.

Cette *propositio* est précédée elle-même d'un exorde (5,1-11), qui joue le rôle d'une transition et d'une introduction et qui expose les

(<sup>1</sup>) Ainsi notamment par O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK 4; Göttingen 1978<sup>s</sup> [1955]); J.-N. ALETTI, *Comment Dieu est-il juste? Clés pour interpréter l'épître aux Romains* (Paris 1992) 38-49; J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York 1993); D.J. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1996); Th. SCHREINER, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 6; Grand Rapids 1998).

(<sup>2</sup>) Ainsi notamment U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer. Röm 1-5* (EKK VI/1; Zürich – Neukirchen 1978) 15-19; 181-182; ID., *Der Brief an die Römer. Röm 6-11* (EKK VI/2; Zürich – Neukirchen 1980) 286-287 (1,18-5,21; 6,1-8,39); R. PESCH, *Römerbrief* (NEB.NT 6; Würzburg 1983) (3,21-8,39); J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38; Dallas 1988) 242-244 (3,21-5,21 et 6,1-11,36).

(<sup>3</sup>) J.-N. ALETTI, «Romains 5,12-21: logique, sens et fonction», *Bib* 78 (1997) 3-32; ID., *Israël et la Loi dans la lettre aux Romains* (LeDiv 173; Paris 1998) 15-32.

(<sup>4</sup>) ALETTI, *Israël et la Loi*, 11-39 (surtout, 20-21).



grandes lignes de la section qui s'ouvre, ainsi que d'une *narratio* (5,12-21), ou exposé des faits, qui fournit des *semina probatorum* de la *probatio* à venir<sup>(5)</sup>. Cette *narratio* s'appuie sur une *synkrisis* — comparaison destinée en l'occurrence à marquer les différences — entre Adam et le Christ. Comme l'observe Aletti, dont la remarque souligne l'unité du développement, cette «*synkrisis* permet de comprendre la seconde, constituée par la *probatio* qui suit, entre deux types d'humanité, la nouvelle (les baptisés en Christ) et l'ancienne (sous la Loi, incapable de faire sortir de l'orbite du péché)»<sup>(6)</sup>.

On voit bien ainsi que l'opposition entre les deux Adam est constitutive de l'argumentation même de ces quatre chapitres. Elle pourrait même être plus présente qu'on ne le reconnaît habituellement dans la mesure où une allusion à Adam nous semble avoir été négligée jusqu'ici dans le débat. Elle se situe à la charnière entre le second volet, négatif, et le troisième volet, positif, de la *probatio*, soit à un moment clé du développement, et réside plus particulièrement dans les expressions antithétiques «corps de mort» et «esprit de vie» qui se succèdent en 7,24 et 8,2.

#### I. 4 Es 3,5 et la possibilité d'une allusion à Adam en Rm 7,24 et 8,2

Les références à Adam sont nombreuses dans le *Quatrième livre d'Esdras*<sup>(7)</sup> et nombre d'entre elles ont été utilisées pour éclairer l'Épître aux Romains<sup>(8)</sup>, plus particulièrement pour illustrer les conséquences qu'ont eues la désobéissance du premier homme pour ses descendants<sup>(9)</sup>. 4 Es 3,4-5 est pourtant resté en dehors du champ de la discussion, alors que la création d'Adam y est évoquée, par Esdras qui s'adresse à Dieu et s'exprime en référence à Gn 2,7, en ces termes:

O Domine Dominator, tu dixisti ab initio, quando plasmasti terram, et hoc solus, et imperasti pulveri, et dedit Adam corpus mortuum. Sed et

<sup>(5)</sup> Ibid., 26.

<sup>(6)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>(7)</sup> Adam est expressément nommé en 4 Es 3,5.10.21.26; 4,30; 6,54.56; 7,11.70.116.118.

<sup>(8)</sup> Ainsi 4 Es 3,7.21-22.26; 7,11.116-118 (voir *infra*, p. 483 et n. 68).

<sup>(9)</sup> Le dossier avait déjà été rassemblé pour une large part (4 Es 3,7.21-22; 7,118) par Bill., III, 227, dont dépendent la plupart des auteurs, sans toutefois le dire. Il a été complété par E. BRANDENBURGER, *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Römer 5,12-21 (1. Kor 15)* (WMANT 7; Neurkirchen 1962) 27-29 (4 Es 3,26; 4,30-31; 7,11.70).

ipsum figmentum manuum tuarum erat, et insufflasti in eum spiritum vitae, et factum est vivens coram te<sup>(10)</sup>.

Nous proposerons, de ce texte, la traduction, volontairement littérale, suivante:

«Ô Seigneur souverain, Tu as parlé au commencement quand Tu as façonné la terre — et cela seul [c'est-à-dire sans aide] — et [quand Tu] as ordonné à la poussière et [qu']elle a donné Adam [à l'état de] corps mort. Pourtant ce corps aussi était l'ouvrage de Tes mains et Tu as insufflé en lui l'esprit de vie, et il fut fait vivant en Ta présence».

Les traducteurs, peut-être surpris par l'expression «corps mort», *corpus mortuum*, qui a pourtant son équivalent dans les versions syriaque et éthiopienne<sup>(11)</sup>, se sont employés le plus souvent à la rendre par «corps sans vie»<sup>(12)</sup>, ou bien par «corps inerte»<sup>(13)</sup>, occultant ainsi son aspect singulier. Parmi les traductions que nous avons consultées, seules celles de Klijn et de Berger rendent l'expression littéralement<sup>(14)</sup>. Plus nombreuses, en revanche, sont

<sup>(10)</sup> Texte retenu dans son édition par R. WEBER, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart 1969). Le texte établi par A.F.J. KLJN, *Der latinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TU 131; Berlin 1983) 25, ne présente par rapport à lui que des divergences mineures qui n'affectent pas les expressions fondamentales que sont, pour nous, *corpus mortuum* et *spiritum vitae*.

<sup>(11)</sup> Rappelons ici que la *Quatrième livre d'Esdras*, dont l'original sémitique (hébreu ou araméen) est, comme la version grecque, perdu, nous est parvenu en latin et dans plusieurs langues orientales. La version latine, connue par une dizaine de manuscrits, les versions syriaque, éthiopienne, ainsi que géorgienne, paraissent les meilleures et sont relativement proches. Les deux versions arabes et la version arménienne sont traduites, pour leur part, plus librement.

<sup>(12)</sup> Ainsi G.H. BOX, «IV Ezra», *APOT* (ed. R.H. CHARLES) (Oxford 1913) II, 562 («a lifeless body»); J. SCHREINER, *Das 4. Buch Esra*, 312 («leblosen Körper»); B.M. METZGER, *OTP* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (London 1983) I, 528 («a lifeless body»); P. GEOLTRAIN, *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (éd. A. DUPONT-SOMMER – M. PHILONENKO) (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris 1987) 1399; M.E. STONE, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 1990) 58.

<sup>(13)</sup> Ainsi L. GRY, *Les dires prophétiques d'Esdras (IV. Esdras)* (Paris 1938) 5, dans la traduction qu'il donne, alors que, dans chacune des colonnes qu'il propose, en une édition synoptique, des versions latine, syriaque et éthiopienne, il traduit littéralement «corps mort» (p. 4).

<sup>(14)</sup> A.F.J. KLJN, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra)* (GCS; Berlin 1992) 5; K. BERGER, *Synopse des Vierten Buches Esra und der Syrischen Baruch-Apokalypse* (TANZ 8; Tübingen 1992) 13. De son côté, B. VIOLET, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (GCS 32; Leipzig 1924) 2, paraphrase en parlant du corps [ou du cadavre] sans vie d'Adam («den leblosen Adams-Leib»), tandis que P. MARRASSINI, «Quarto Libro di Ezra», *Apocrifi dell'Antico*

celles qui proposent un peu plus loin une restitution exacte de l'expression *spiritum vitae* en la rendant par «l'esprit de vie»<sup>(15)</sup>, même si beaucoup se contentent de «souffle de vie»<sup>(16)</sup>.

Ainsi traduit et, ajouterions-nous volontiers, respecté, le texte de 4 Es 3,5 peut évoquer la transformation qui s'opère entre le cri de désespoir qui résonne en Rm 7,24: «qui me délivrera de ce corps de mort (ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου)?» et le cri de délivrance qui retentit en Rm 8,2: «la Loi de l'Esprit de vie (ὁ [...] νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς) en Jésus-Christ t'a délivré de la Loi du péché et de la mort». La libération qu'opère l'Esprit de vie en délivrant le sujet de son corps de mort peut évoquer l'acte créateur par lequel Dieu donne au premier homme, corps mort, d'accéder à la vie.

Le parallèle que nous proposons d'effectuer ainsi entre les deux passages nous paraît se recommander du fait que nous avons affaire avec les deux expressions «corps de mort» ou «corps mort», d'une part, et «Esprit de vie», d'autre part, à des expressions, l'une et l'autre fort rares, dont la présence commune en deux écrits distincts a peu de chances d'être fortuite.

Rappelons d'abord que Paul n'emploie nulle part ailleurs l'expression «corps de mort», qui ne peut être rapprochée, dans ses lettres, que de l'expression «corps de péché» que l'on rencontre en Rm 6,6.

Quant à «l'Esprit de Vie», il n'apparaît sous sa plume ou sous sa dictée qu'en Rm 8,2, alors qu'il parle ailleurs, outre de l'Esprit, de l'Esprit Saint, de l'Esprit de Dieu, de l'Esprit du Christ<sup>(17)</sup>, de l'Esprit de Sainteté (Rm 1,4), de l'Esprit d'adoption (Rm 8,15), et de l'Esprit de foi (2 Co 4,13). On se contente le plus souvent d'observer que la Loi de l'Esprit est la loi eschatologique (cf. Jr 31,31-34; Éz 36,26-27)<sup>(18)</sup> ou de faire valoir que «la Loi de l'Esprit de vie» évoque de

---

*Testamento* (a cura di P. SACCHI) (Classici delle Religioni. La religione ebraica; Torino 1989) II, 294, traduit par «corps mortel» («corpo mortale»).

<sup>(15)</sup> Ibidem. Voir aussi GRY, *Les dires prophétiques d'Esdras*, 5; GEOLTRAIN, *La Bible*, 1399; MARRASSINI, *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, II, 294.

<sup>(16)</sup> Ainsi BOX, *APOT*, II, 562; METZGER, *OTP*, I, 528, et STONE, *Fourth Ezra*, 58 («breath of life»); SCHREINER, *Das 4. Buch Esra*, 312 («Lebensatem»); KLIJN, *Die Esra-Apokalypse*, 5 («Lebensodem»).

<sup>(17)</sup> Rm 8,9. Voir aussi «l'Esprit du Seigneur» (2 Co 3,17); «l'Esprit de Jésus-Christ» (Ph 1,19) et «l'Esprit de Son Fils» (Ga 4,6).

<sup>(18)</sup> Ainsi notamment S. LYONNET, «Rom 8,2-4 à la lumière de Jérémie 31 et d'Ezéchiel 35-39», *Études sur l'Épître aux Romains* (AnBib 120; Roma 1989) 231-241 (avec bibliographie complémentaire).

manière antithétique «la loi du péché et de la mort»<sup>(19)</sup>. Ces observations, qui n'ont rien de nouveau<sup>(20)</sup>, sont tout à fait pertinentes. Toutefois, la première ne rend pas pleinement compte de la présence ici de l'«Esprit de vie» et la seconde invite à effectuer un rapprochement avec des notions, le péché et la mort, qui ont été plus particulièrement rattachées à la figure d'Adam en Rm 5,12-19. Par ailleurs, il est frappant de constater que, en 1 Co 15,45, alors précisément qu'il se livre à une comparaison des deux Adam, Paul parle du second en tant qu'«esprit vivifiant»: «le premier homme, Adam, advint en tant qu'âme vivante (εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν); le dernier Adam en tant qu'esprit vivifiant (εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν)». Cela peut étayer l'hypothèse selon laquelle c'est parce qu'il voulait faire allusion à la vivification d'Adam, que d'aucuns attribuaient à l'«Esprit de vie», que Paul a eu recours, en Rm 8,2, à cette expression qu'il n'utilise nulle part ailleurs.

Il convient d'ajouter que cette expression est fort peu fréquente tant dans le Premier Testament que dans la littérature intertestamentaire.

De fait, on ne rencontre «l'esprit de vie», dans la Septante, qu'en deux endroits, en Gn 6,17 et en Gn 7,15, où elle désigne, dans le cadre du récit du Déluge, le principe de vie qui se trouve en toute créature animée. Elle traduit, dans les deux cas, littéralement l'expression hébraïque *rwḥ ḥyym* qui apparaît encore en Gn 7,22, où la Septante l'a traduite cette fois par *πνοὴ ζωῆς*. Il est manifeste que, en tous ces passages, l'expression ne fait pas l'objet d'une valorisation particulière.

Il est toutefois possible d'envisager, nous semble-t-il, que Gn 2,7, passage dans lequel la Bible hébraïque indique que Dieu a façonné à Adam à partir de la poussière et a insufflé dans ses narines une haleine de vie, a fait l'objet de relectures qui consistaient à valoriser cette haleine de vie et qui tendaient à la transformer en esprit de vie. C'est ainsi que, alors que la Septante se contente de rendre littéralement l'hébreu en employant le verbe *ἐμφυσάω* et l'expression *πνοὴν ζωῆς*, les versions d'Aquila, de Symmaque et de Théodotion substituent le vocable *ἀναπνοή* à *πνοή* et surtout, pour les deux dernières nommées du moins, remplacent le verbe *ἐμφυσάω* par *πνέω*, recourant ainsi à un terme de la famille même de *πνεῦμα*.

<sup>(19)</sup> WILCKENS, *Römer*, II, 123.

<sup>(20)</sup> LYONNET, *Études sur l'Épître aux Romains*, 231, renvoie ainsi à l'exégèse de Thomas d'Aquin.

Par ailleurs, dans un psaume non canonique retrouvé à Qumrân, la Création est évoquée de la manière suivante: «Et par Son Esprit, Il les établit [ou “les fit se tenir debout”] pour régenter tous ceux qui sont sur la terre et tous [...]» (4Q381, fr. 1, l. 7). Il est intéressant de relever que l'Esprit (ou le souffle) (*rwḥ*) se substitue ici à l'haleine (*nšmh*) comme principe vivifiant, d'autant que, dans un autre document qumrânien contenant «une eulogie célébrant la puissance et la providence divines culminant dans le jugement dernier qui séparera définitivement les impies et les justes»<sup>(21)</sup> (4Q418, fragment 126)<sup>(22)</sup>, «Esprit de vie», «gloire éternelle» et «paix perpétuelle» paraissent ensemble promis aux élus (l. 8). Ces élus sont appelés «fils d'Ève» à la ligne suivante, expression rarissime<sup>(23)</sup> qui nous ramène elle aussi à des spéculations relatives à la Création, la description de la nouvelle s'appuyant en l'occurrence sur celle de l'ancienne.

L'expression πνεῦμα ζωῆς apparaît encore en *Testament d'Abraham* 18,11, dans un contexte de résurrection, puisque Dieu y envoie un «esprit de vie» sur ceux qui ont péri et qui, dès lors, sont rendus à la vie. Elle est encore présente en *Testament de Ruben* 2,4, dans un contexte de création cette fois, puisqu'il y est question de «l'Esprit de vie (πνεῦμα ζωῆς) par lequel est créée (κτίζεται) la constitution [de tout humain]». Elle se trouve également en *Joseph et Aséneth* 16,14 (recension longue) où, dans un contexte initiatique, le rayon de miel proposé par l'ange à Aséneth est présenté comme «esprit de vie» et s'avère être la nourriture de tous les anges et de tous les élus<sup>(24)</sup>. Par ailleurs, l'expression *spiritum vitae* apparaît dans la relecture qu'opère, outre 4 Es 3,5, la *Vie latine d'Adam et Ève* de Gn 2,7 quand le diable y rappelle à Adam le moment où Dieu a insufflé l'esprit de vie (*spiritum vitae*) en lui<sup>(25)</sup>. On rencontre aussi «l'Esprit

<sup>(21)</sup> A. CAQUOT, «Les textes de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire)», *RHPhR* 76 (1996) 27.

<sup>(22)</sup> L'édition officielle de ce document a été proposée par J. STRUGNELL – D.J. HARRINGTON, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction: 4Q415ff.* (DJD 34; Oxford 1999) 349-357. Nous suivons ici la lecture d'A. CAQUOT, *ibidem*.

<sup>(23)</sup> A. CAQUOT, *ibidem*, rappelle qu'elle est «étrangère à la Bible et apparemment nouvelle à Qoumrân». Il ne lui trouve de parallèle qu'en Hen(aeth) 69,7 [en fait 62,7], où on trouve l'expression «fils de la mère de tous vivants».

<sup>(24)</sup> Voir encore JosAs 19,11.

<sup>(25)</sup> On pourra relever, sans que l'argument puisse être absolument probant vu la date plus tardive à laquelle a été effectuée la traduction de la Vulgate, que cette dernière parle en Gn 2,7 non pas de *spiritum vitae*, mais de *spiraculum vitae*. On pourra voir là un indice du fait que la lecture de Gn 2,7 en termes d'«esprit de vie»

de vie» en Hen(aeth) 61,7 où les anges, rendus sages par lui, ont vocation à exalter et glorifier l'Elu. Quant à Philon, il commente Gn 2,7 en disant que le souffle de vie insufflé en Adam n'est autre que l'Esprit divin (πνεῦμα θεῖον) par lequel l'homme a été rendu participant non seulement de la nature mortelle mais aussi de la nature immortelle<sup>(26)</sup>.

Le philosophe alexandrin développe au demeurant une anthropologie spécifique. Son originalité réside notamment dans le fait qu'il identifie l'acte par lequel Dieu vivifie le premier Adam en lui insufflant la face et celui par lequel il fait de lui une image et une imitation du Logos<sup>(27)</sup> ou, comme il le dit encore, une empreinte fidèle de l'image divine<sup>(28)</sup>. Ce faisant, il recourt tant à Gn 1,26-27 qu'à Gn 2,7 pour démontrer que l'existence conférée par l'esprit divin est d'un tout autre ordre que celle qui se réduit à la chair et au sang de la motte de terre qu'est l'humain à l'état brut<sup>(29)</sup>. Il développe ainsi une anthropologie qui n'est pas sans évoquer la distinction établie par 4 Es 3,5 entre l'Adam, corps mort façonné à partir de la poussière, et l'Adam vivifié par l'Esprit de vie. Le passage suivant du *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* § 56–58 l'atteste:

<sup>56</sup>Pour la substance de l'intellect, il [le législateur, qui a établi la double substance de l'âme: le sang, pour ce qui est de l'ensemble et de ses diverses composantes; le souffle divin, pour la partie qui gouverne le tout] ne la rattache à rien de créé, il la représente comme insufflée d'en haut par Dieu (ὕπὸ θεοῦ καταπνευσθεῖσαν): «le Créateur de l'univers», dit-il, «souffla sur son visage un souffle de vie et l'homme devint âme vivante» (Gn 2,7); et c'est de cette manière qu'on nous apprend aussi que nous avons reçu la marque «selon l'image» du Créateur.<sup>57</sup> Aussi y a-t-il deux sortes d'hommes, ceux qui existent par le souffle divin, le raisonnement (θεῖω πνεύματι λογισμῶ), et ceux qui vivent par le sang et par le plaisir de la chair. Cette deuxième espèce est ouvrage de terre, la première est empreinte fidèle de l'image divine.<sup>58</sup> Or, cette motte de terre modelée que nous sommes, imprégnée de sang, a grandement besoin du secours de Dieu (...), car

---

(*spiritum vitae*) suppose bien une réinterprétation du texte et sa valorisation à travers le passage de la notion de souffle à celle d'esprit de vie.

<sup>(26)</sup> Philon, *De opificio Mundi* 135.

<sup>(27)</sup> Philon, *De opificio Mundi* 139.

<sup>(28)</sup> Philon, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 57 (texte cité *infra*).

<sup>(29)</sup> Le recours conjoint que fait Philon à ces deux textes a été bien mis en évidence par R.A. BAER, *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (ALGHJ 3; Leiden 1970) 20-26, et par J.R. LEVISON, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS 1; Sheffield 1988) 63-88.

la masse de sang, d'elle-même prête à se dissoudre, vrai cadavre (νεκρός), reçoit sa consistance <sup>(30)</sup> [s'organise] et le feu qui la vivifie [et est ranimée] de [par] la providence de Dieu: Il tend Sa main pour la secourir et la protège de son bouclier (...) <sup>(31)</sup>.

M. Harl, dans l'introduction à ce passage et à deux autres développements de teneur semblable au sein du même traité<sup>(32)</sup>, relève que l'image du corps cadavre appartient à la tradition philosophique, illustrée par un fragment du *Protreptique* d'Aristote<sup>(33)</sup> qui narre le châtement qu'infligeaient les Tyrrhéniens à leurs captifs en les attachant face à face avec un cadavre pour signifier la relation existant entre l'âme et le corps <sup>(34)</sup>. Pareille conception se rencontre en bien des endroits chez Philon<sup>(35)</sup>. Le fait que, outre dans le passage que nous venons de citer, en *Legum allegoriae* I,31-32, qui constitue un commentaire de Gn 2,7, pareille représentation s'articule à une compréhension bien particulière du récit des origines invite à établir aussi un lien avec des spéculations proprement juives relatives à la création d'Adam.

Dans ce cadre, un rapprochement avec *Legum allegoriae* III,70 se recommande. Il y est indiqué que, «dès le début (ἐξ ἀρχῆς), Il [Dieu] a fait du corps un cadavre (νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα ἀπειργάσατο)» <sup>(36)</sup>, et ce dans un contexte où il vient juste d'être dit que «la masse de peau, notre corps (...) est mauvaise, insidieuse envers l'âme, un cadavre, une chose toujours morte» <sup>(37)</sup>.

N'apparaît-il pas, dès lors, qu'une lecture du récit de la Genèse proche de celle qu'atteste 4 Es 3,5 a influencé la réflexion de Philon? Cela accredit l'hypothèse selon laquelle la distinction, à propos de la création d'Adam, entre son corps mort, qui avait été façonné dans un premier temps, et son être animé par l'Esprit divin ou l'Esprit de vie était assez largement répandue et a pu être connue de Paul.

<sup>(30)</sup> On pourra noter le parallèle de représentation et de terminologie avec TestXII.Rub 2,4 (voir *supra*, p. 477).

<sup>(31)</sup> Traduction M. HARL, *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* (éd. R. ARNALDEZ – J. POUILLOUX – C. MONDÉSERT) (Paris 1966) IV, 193 et 195.

<sup>(32)</sup> *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* § 274 et 309.

<sup>(33)</sup> D'après Jamblique, *Protreptique* 8.

<sup>(34)</sup> HARL, *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, IV, 44, n. 1.

<sup>(35)</sup> Ainsi *Legum allegoriae* I,108; III,69-70; *De somniis* I,46.110; II,237; *De Gigantibus* 15.

<sup>(36)</sup> Traduction Cl. MONDÉSERT, *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1962) II, 208.

<sup>(37)</sup> Philon, *Legum Allegoriae* 69 (traduction MONDÉSERT, *ibidem*).

## II. Rm 7,24 et 8,2 parmi d'autres références à la figure d'Adam en Rm 5-8

Outre la référence explicite à Adam en Rm 5,12-21, des allusions aux récits de la Création et plus particulièrement aux passages ayant trait à la création du premier homme ou du premier couple ont été décelées depuis longtemps à l'arrière-plan de Rm 5-8 et, déjà, de Rm 1-4.

De tels échos sont perçus par certains dès Rm 1,20-24. Dans ces versets, la référence explicite à la Création (v. 20) et le développement relatif successivement à la place que les humains y occupent, à la connaissance de Dieu qu'ils possèdent et à la rébellion qui est pourtant la leur et qui débouche sur une perte de statut, ont pu être interprétés comme faisant allusion à Gn 2-3<sup>(38)</sup>. Quant à la formulation du verset 23, avec sa référence à la gloire de Dieu<sup>(39)</sup>, avec l'emploi qui y est fait des termes « ressemblance » (ὁμοίωμα) et « image » (εἰκόν)<sup>(40)</sup>, et avec l'énumération des créatures (oiseaux, quadrupèdes, reptiles) qui le conclut, elle a donné lieu à différents essais de lecture à la lumière de Gn 2-3<sup>(41)</sup>, par-delà la référence également présente à Jr 2,11, ainsi surtout qu'au Ps 106,20 et à l'évocation qui y est faite de l'épisode du veau d'or.

Vient ensuite, en Rm 3,23, une autre allusion qui pourrait être essentielle. Elle pose en effet, reprenant ainsi en des termes nouveaux la thèse qui avait régi le long développement conduisant de Rm 1,18 à 3,20 et la conclusion à laquelle il avait mené<sup>(42)</sup>, l'égalité

<sup>(38)</sup> Ainsi notamment DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 61-62, qui renvoie également à Sg 2,23-24 (72). On notera que pareille lecture est réfutée par d'autres, tel FITZMYER, *Romans*, 274.

<sup>(39)</sup> Voir *infra*, p. 481.

<sup>(40)</sup> Cet emploi peut évoquer celui des mots ὁμοίωσις (de même sens que ὁμοίωμα) et εἰκόν en Gn 1,26-27 (LXX).

<sup>(41)</sup> Ainsi, notamment, N. HYLDAHL, «A Reminiscence of the Old Testament at Romans i. 23», *NTS* 2 (1955-56) 285-288; M.D. HOOKER, «Adam in Romans 1», *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 297-306; ID., «A Further Note on Romans 1», *NTS* 13 (1966-67) 181-183; J. JERVELL, *Imago Dei. Gen 1:26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 76; Göttingen 1960) 115-116; 321-322; WILCKENS, *Römer*, I, 107; J. WEDDERBURN, «Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans», *Studia Biblica 3. Papers on Paul and other New Testament Authors* (ed. E.A. LIVINGSTONE) (JSNTSS 3; Sheffield 1980) 413-419; SCHREINER, *Romans*, 81.87-88.

<sup>(42)</sup> Sur la dynamique de ce développement, voir ALETTI, *Comment Dieu est-il juste?*, 54-80.



fondamentale de tous les humains devant Dieu. Mais, s'il avait été indiqué auparavant que tous encouraient la colère de Dieu (Rm 1,18) et qu'aucune chair ne pouvait être justifiée à partir des œuvres de la Loi (Rm 3,19-20), il est maintenant affirmé que tous sont également privés de la gloire de Dieu. La référence à la figure d'Adam apparaît ici particulièrement appropriée et difficilement contestable.

De fait, de nombreux textes attestent qu'était largement répandue la conception selon laquelle, par la chute, Adam — ou le premier couple — s'était trouvé dépouillé de la gloire de Dieu. C'est ainsi que, dans la *Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève*, Ève reproche au serpent de lui avoir aliéné sa gloire (20,2), avant qu'Adam ne la réprimande à son tour pour lui avoir aliéné la gloire de Dieu (21,6). Pour sa part, l'*Apocalypse grecque de Baruch* rappelle qu'«Adam (...) a subi la condamnation et a été dévêtu de la gloire de Dieu» (4,16) et Hen(gr) 30,11 [texte long], qu'il fut une créature «honorée, grande et glorieuse». À cette représentation de la gloire initiale et perdue d'Adam correspondait la conception selon laquelle l'accomplissement des temps aurait notamment pour caractéristique le retour à la gloire originelle<sup>(43)</sup>, appelée, dans trois textes qumrâniens, la gloire d'Adam (*kbwd 'dm*)<sup>(44)</sup>! Une tension entre la gloire de Dieu qu'avait perdue Adam et la gloire à venir des élus, qui serait restauration dans la gloire d'Adam, était ainsi présente. Or elle se retrouve en Rm 1–8<sup>(45)</sup> où, si tous ont, à l'image d'Adam, perdu la gloire de Dieu (3,23), les croyants ne s'enorgueillissent pas moins dans l'espérance de cette même gloire (5,2), gloire à venir (8,18), mais qui s'est manifestée déjà dans la résurrection du Fils (6,4) et au bénéfice de laquelle se trouveront (8,17.21) et se trouvent dès maintenant, dans un présent revêtant une forte coloration eschatologique, les fils, prédestinés, appelés et justifiés (8,30).

Vient ensuite Rm 5,12-21, passage essentiel dans lequel se déploie la thématique des deux Adam. Comme l'a souligné O. Michel, 5,12-21, ces versets, qui font, à première vue, figure d'insertion (*Einlage*)

<sup>(43)</sup> Vont notamment dans ce sens Hen(aeth) 50,1; 4 Es 7,122-125; ApcBar(gr) 51,1.3; 54,15.21 et, plus encore, les textes qui sont cités à la note suivante.

<sup>(44)</sup> Règle de la Communauté (IQS) 4,23; Écrit de Damas (CD) 3,20; Hymnes (IQH) 17,15 [numérotation de Sukenik]. On notera que la VitAd(gr) 39, 2 attend pour sa part la restauration d'Adam dans sa primauté (ἀρχή).

<sup>(45)</sup> Ce fait est notamment reconnu par R. SCROGGS, *The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia 1966) 26.48-49; PESCH, *Römerbrief*, 41; DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 168; SCHREINER, *Romans*, 187.

dans le contexte, fournissent en fait le thème des chapitres suivants. Ils apparaissent de fait comme «une représentation mythique et imagée du grand tournant eschatologique que vont décrire les chapitres 6–8»<sup>(46)</sup>. À la typologie antithétique Adam-Christ vont correspondre ensuite tant l'opposition entre ancien et nouvel éon que la triade antithétique Loi-péché-mort / grâce-justification-vie<sup>(47)</sup>. Le but est de montrer que «tout le problème de la condition humaine est déterminé par un fait inaugural relevant respectivement de la protologie et de l'eschatologie (*eine Urdatum der Vorzeit und der Endzeit*)»<sup>(48)</sup>.

Il est possible que Paul, en travaillant ainsi l'opposition Adam-Christ, s'appuie en fait sur une tradition juive palestinienne qui faisait valoir que, à l'horizon dernier, le principe selon lequel «la mesure du bien est plus grande que celle du mal» s'appliquerait, de sorte que le juste transmettrait une faveur sans commune mesure avec la punition ayant résulté de la désobéissance du premier homme. Ce principe, énoncé et illustré en *Sifré Lévitique* 5,17, était déjà mis en avant par Paul Billerbeck pour éclairer Rm 5,12-21<sup>(49)</sup>, avant que d'autres ne l'utilisent à leur tour à cette même fin<sup>(50)</sup>.

Certes, il ne peut être établi que ce principe était déjà été formulé ainsi au premier siècle. Toutefois, Paul, en affirmant que le péché et la mort d'Adam se sont propagés à tous les humains, fait usage d'un mode de représentation bien attesté à cette époque.

En ce qui concerne la mort, Sagesse 2,23-24 illustre déjà le principe de sa propagation à partir de la chute en recourant à des termes auxquels le début de Rm 5,12 (ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν) semble faire écho: «Dieu a créé l'homme pour l'incorruptibilité et Il l'a fait image de Son éternité. Mais, par la jalousie du diable, la mort est entrée dans le monde (θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον): ils l'éprouvent, ceux qui sont de son parti». Siracide 25,24 fait de même, tout en incriminant Ève et en associant pour sa part chaîne du péché et chaîne de la mort: «De la femme (est venu) le commencement du péché et à cause d'elle nous mourons tous». A son tour, le *Livre des antiquités bibliques* indique que, quand Adam a transgressé les voies divines, après qu'il eut été convaincu par sa femme qui avait été séduite par le serpent, «alors a été établie la mort dans les générations des hommes»

<sup>(46)</sup> MICHEL, *Römer*, 185.

<sup>(47)</sup> Ainsi MICHEL, *ibidem*.

<sup>(48)</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>(49)</sup> Bill., III, 230.

<sup>(50)</sup> Ainsi MICHEL, *Römer*, 186, et ALETTI, *Israël et la Loi*, 119-121.

(13,8). Dans une perspective semblable, en 4 Es 3,7, le héros, qui est appelé le scribe de la connaissance du Très-Haut (14,50), s'adresse à Dieu à propos d'Adam en ces termes: «Tu requis de lui un seul commandement et il l'enfreignit, et aussitôt Tu instituas la mort pour lui et pour ses descendants» <sup>(51)</sup>. Mais nulle part l'insistance n'est plus forte qu'en 2 *Baruch* où il est indiqué qu'Adam «a introduit la mort et abrégé les années de ceux qui sont nés de lui» (17,3) et que son péché a entraîné un décret de mort contre tous ses descendants (23,4). Le premier homme est encore apostrophé par Baruch sur un ton lourd de reproches: «Qu'as-tu fait Adam à l'endroit de toute ta postérité?» (48,42), même si une distinction est opérée entre la mort inéluctable qu'a amenée sur les humains sa désobéissance et la destinée ultime de chacun qui n'est pas, pour sa part, inscrite dans la condamnation d'Adam (54,15.19).

Pour ce qui est du péché, 4 Es insiste tout spécialement sur le fait que la désobéissance d'Adam a plongé toute sa descendance dans le péché. Ainsi lit-on en 3,21-22:

Porteur d'un cœur mauvais, le premier Adam (ou Adam, le premier), a transgressé et a été vaincu, mais (avec lui) aussi tous ceux qui sont nés de lui. Et cela devint une infirmité permanente: la Loi (était) avec le cœur du peuple (conjointement) avec la racine du mal.

Un peu plus loin, 4,30-31 raisonne en ces termes:

Un grain de semence mauvaise a été semé dans le cœur d'Adam dès le commencement et combien d'impiété n'a-t-il pas généré jusqu'à maintenant et combien n'en générera-t-il pas jusqu'à ce que vienne la moisson (eschatologique)! Considère en toi-même combien (grand est) le fruit d'impiété qu'a généré le grain de semence mauvaise.

Enfin 7,118 interpelle ainsi le premier homme: «Ô toi, qu'as-tu fait, Adam? En effet, si tu as péché, ta chute n'a pas été la tienne seule, mais aussi la nôtre, (à nous) qui provenons de toi».

Si, en Rm 5,12-21, Paul fait ainsi référence explicite à Adam en recourant à des thèmes et à des motifs que la tradition juive attachait à sa personne, les allusions à ces thèmes et à ces motifs ne s'estompent pas une fois que la référence explicite au premier homme n'a plus cours. Bien au contraire, la référence adamique, explicitement présente dans la *narratio* de 5,12-21, l'est implicitement à toutes les étapes et dans tous les volets de la *probatio* qui suit en 6,1-8,30.

<sup>(51)</sup> Le rapprochement de ce texte et des passages, empruntés à *ApcBar(syr)*, qui suivent, avec Rm 5,12 était déjà effectué par Bill., III, 227.

Abordons d'abord le premier de ces volets, positif, qui se déploie en deux temps (6,1-14 et 6,15-7,6).

En 6,4, verset dont la formulation elle-même rappelle 5,12-14 où étaient mises en contraste les économies respectives d'Adam et du Christ<sup>(52)</sup>, l'affirmation singulière selon laquelle Christ est ressuscité des morts *par la gloire du Père* ne fait-elle pas allusion à la gloire de Dieu dont sont privés les hommes depuis la chute et qui est à nouveau accessible depuis Pâques<sup>(53)</sup>? Et l'effet qui résulte de cette résurrection pour les croyants, à savoir qu'ils marchent désormais en nouveauté de vie (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς), ne correspond-il pas à une forme de nouvelle création? On peut l'envisager d'autant plus sérieusement, nous semble-t-il, que Paul, qui ne recourt que rarement au concept de nouveauté<sup>(54)</sup>, le réserve, si l'on exclut les deux passages où il s'applique à la Nouvelle Alliance<sup>(55)</sup>, à des développements dans lesquels il est question, explicitement ou implicitement, de la nouvelle création instaurée par l'événement Jésus Christ, événement salutaire par lequel les croyants peuvent accéder à l'état de nouvelles créatures<sup>(56)</sup>. Dans ces conditions, la référence faite, en Rm 6,6, à notre vieil homme qui a été crucifié avec (le Christ) pour que fût aboli le corps de péché peut apparaître à son tour comme une allusion à la thématique adamique. Plus précisément, elle peut passer pour une application de la problématique des deux Adam à la condition humaine, transformée depuis la Croix, puisque désormais est offerte

<sup>(52)</sup> Ainsi FITZMYER, *Romans*, 434.

<sup>(53)</sup> Sur ce motif, voir *supra*, p. 481.

<sup>(54)</sup> Dans les sept épîtres généralement tenues pour authentiques, on relève cinq occurrences de l'adjectif καινός (1 Co 11,25; 2 Co 3,6; 5,17 [2 x]; Ga 6,15), deux du substantif καινότης (Rm 6,4; 7,6) et deux des composés ἀνακαινώω (2 Co 4,16) et ἀνακαινώσις (Rm 12,2)

<sup>(55)</sup> 1 Co 11,25; 2 Co 3,6.

<sup>(56)</sup> La référence à la (nouvelle) création est explicite en 2 Co 5,17 et Ga 6,16, et manifeste en 2 Co 4,16. À la lumière de ces passages, une référence implicite à cette même création apparaît sous jacente à l'emploi du vocabulaire de la nouveauté en Rm 6,4; 7,6 et 12,1.

Les lettres deutéropauliniennes s'inscrivent dans la ligne de ce recours spécifique au champ lexical de la nouveauté. Les deux seuls passages où y apparaît l'adjectif καινός, Ép 2,15 et 4,24, traitent de l'homme nouveau qu'il s'agit de revêtir au sein de la création nouvelle, l'emploi conjoint du verbe κτίζω et de l'adjectif καινός dans ces deux versets étant révélateur à cet égard. La même conjonction d'emploi d'un terme de la famille de καινός (ἀνακαινώω) et du verbe κτίζω se rencontre en Col 3,10, alors que, en Tt 3,5, ce sont les deux concepts de «nouvelle création» (παλιγγενεσία) et de «renouvellement» (ἀνακαινώσις) qui se trouvent associés.

aux croyants la possibilité de dévêtir le vieil homme pour revêtir le nouveau. Quant à la mention qui est faite, un peu plus loin, en 6,12, du «corps mortel» qui caractérise l'humaine condition, elle peut être lue comme un nouveau rappel, discret, de la chute et de ses conséquences, au même titre d'ailleurs que l'évocation faite, dans le même verset, de nos «désirs» ou de nos «convoitises»<sup>(57)</sup>.

La référence adamique est ainsi bien présente dans la section argumentative qui conduit de 6,1 à 6,15. Elle affleure aussi au terme du développement qu'inaugure la *subpropositio* de 6,15 (6,15–7,6). De fait, la mention, en 7,6, de «la nouveauté de l'Esprit» dans laquelle il s'agit désormais de servir, alors que l'économie ancienne était régie pour sa part par «l'ancienneté de la lettre», vient signifier la transformation radicale générée par la mort et la résurrection du Christ. Elles ont permis le passage du régime de la Loi, de l'économie mosaïque de la lettre, à l'ère libératrice de l'Esprit, lui-même créateur dès l'origine<sup>(58)</sup> et instrument désormais de nouvelle création.

Le second volet, négatif, de la *probatio*, qui lui aussi comporte deux éléments (7,7-12 et 7,13-25), va faire une place encore plus grande à la référence adamique, tout particulièrement présente en 7,7-12.

Paul, tout au long de cette section argumentative, va recourir à un «je», qui a fait couler beaucoup d'encre<sup>(59)</sup>, mais dont il est de plus en plus reconnu aujourd'hui que, comme l'avait déjà largement compris l'exégèse patristique<sup>(60)</sup>, il englobe celui d'Adam et de son expérience protologique<sup>(61)</sup>.

<sup>(57)</sup> A ce sujet, voir *infra*, p. 486.

<sup>(58)</sup> Voir Gn 1–2 et notre développement *supra*, pp. 476-478.

<sup>(59)</sup> Pour un bon état de la question et un aperçu des diverses interprétations qui ont eu cours depuis les Pères jusqu'à l'époque contemporaine, voir notamment W.G. KÜMMEL, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus* (UNT 17; Leipzig 1929), et S. LYONNET, «L'histoire du salut selon le chapitre VII de l'épître aux Romains», *Études*, 203-230 (= *Bib* 43 (1962) 117-151). Le débat est bien résumé par MOO, *Romans*, 425-426.

<sup>(60)</sup> L'interprétation est attestée tant chez un auteur syrien comme Éphrem qu'au sein de l'école d'Alexandrie (chez Didyme l'Aveugle) et de celle d'Antioche (Méthode, *De Resurrectione* I,5,2; 57,1; 58,2; II,1,1-5; Théodore de Mopsueste; Gennade de Constantinople). Voir notamment à ce propos LYONNET, *Études*, 215 et 228-229.

<sup>(61)</sup> Ainsi, notamment, DUNN, *Romans* 1–8, 400,404. Les auteurs qui, à la suite de Tertullien, *De Pudicitia* 17, considèrent que le «je» qu'emploie ici Paul est celui de l'homme non sauvé (qu'il soit juif ou païen) conservent au passage la portée tout à fait générale que lui confère de fait la référence adamique, même s'ils ne s'appuient pas sur elle pour conclure en ce sens.

Déjà Rm 7,7 oriente le regard en direction du récit des origines avec la formule: «Je n'aurais pas connu la convoitise si la Loi n'avait dit: 'Tu ne convoiteras pas'». De fait, les lecteurs de Paul n'avaient probablement pas de difficulté à associer le commandement ou la mise en garde contre le péché fondamental de convoitise, outre avec le Décalogue (Ex 20,17 // Dt 5,21), avec le péché primordial d'Ève et d'Adam<sup>(62)</sup>, et cela pour au moins deux raisons. Il apparaît d'abord que la convoitise était conçue comme la cause même de la chute et, partant, comme le principe de tout péché, ce que montre plus particulièrement la *Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève* dans la relecture qu'elle effectue, en 19,3, de Gn 3,1-7. Le texte précise en l'occurrence que le serpent plaça sur le fruit qu'il donna à manger à la femme «le venin de sa malice, c'est-à-dire la convoitise» (τὸν ἰὸν τῆς κακίας αὐτοῦ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν), et ajoute, en incise, que «la convoitise est en effet le principe de tout péché» (ἐπιθυμία γάρ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἁμαρτίας)<sup>(63)</sup>. On peut d'ailleurs noter que, de manière plus générale, la conception selon laquelle la convoitise est à l'origine de tout péché était déjà devenue une forme de *theologoumenon* largement répandu dans la pensée juive<sup>(64)</sup>. Par ailleurs, le commandement (ἡ ἐντολή), qui fait une entrée massive dans l'argumentation aussitôt qu'a été évoqué l'interdit fondamental et primordial de la convoitise<sup>(65)</sup> et qui y côtoie dès lors le concept essentiel de Loi (νόμος), paraît avoir été associé de manière particulière, dans la tradition juive, au récit de la chute, comme le montrent à la fois la *Septante*, les *targumim* et la *Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève*. De fait, dans la *Septante*, le verbe «commander» (ἐντέλλομαι) revient à trois reprises pour indiquer, puis pour rappeler, que Dieu a ordonné à Adam de ne pas manger du fruit de l'arbre de la connaissance du bien et du mal (Gn 2,16; 3,11.17). Le témoignage des *targumim* est également éloquent. Le *Neofiti* précise, en Gn 2,15, que «Yahvé Élohim prit Adam et le fit habiter dans le jardin d'Éden pour rendre un culte selon la Loi et pour garder Ses commandements»<sup>(66)</sup>. Un peu plus loin, en Gn 3,9, Dieu demande à

<sup>(62)</sup> Ainsi DUNN, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

<sup>(63)</sup> Traduction D. BERTRAND, *La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève*. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire (Recherches intertestamentaires 1; Paris 1987) 85.

<sup>(64)</sup> Ainsi Philon, *De Opificio mundi* 152; *De Decalogo* 142; 150; 153; 173; *De Specialibus Legibus* IV,84-85. Voir aussi ApcAbr 24,8 et Jq 1,15.

<sup>(65)</sup> Rm 7,8.9.10.11.12.

<sup>(66)</sup> L'emploi des italiques signale un ajout du *targum* dont nous reprenons, ici et dans la suite de ce paragraphe, la traduction de R. LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque*. Traduction des deux recensions palestiniennes complètes avec

Adam: «Où est le commandement que Je t'avais donné?», alors que, en 3,10, selon le *pseudo-Jonathan*, Adam s'humilie devant Dieu en ces termes: «J'ai transgressé le commandement que Tu m'avais donné»<sup>(67)</sup>. Quant à la *Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève*, elle multiplie les références au commandement (ἐντολή) dans la relecture qu'elle opère du récit de la chute et déplore qu'Ève n'ait pas gardé (οὐκ ἐφύλαξεν) le commandement de Dieu (10,2), pas plus qu'Adam d'ailleurs (24,3; 39,1), à qui il est encore reproché de l'avoir abandonné (ἐγκατέλιπες: 23,3), de ne l'avoir pas écouté (παρήκουσας: 24,1; 25,1) et de l'avoir, avec sa femme, transgressé (παρέβημεν: 42,7)<sup>(68)</sup>.

On peut dès lors considérer à bon droit que l'histoire du paradis est ici, conjointement avec les récits relatifs au don de la Loi au Sinaï, en vue, Paul amalgamant, d'une part, le commandement du Décalogue et l'interdit de Gn 2,16-17 et, d'autre part, l'histoire de la connaissance du péché avec l'histoire de la chute en Gn 3. Les versets 9 et 10 trouvent d'ailleurs leur explication la plus évidente dans une lecture en fonction de l'itinéraire d'Adam. De fait, c'est à propos de lui seul qu'il est possible d'effectuer une distinction nette entre un avant du commandement, caractérisé par la vie, et un après du commandement, placé pour sa part sous le sceau du péché et de la mort<sup>(69)</sup>. Ainsi peut-on dire que

le caractère typique de l'expérience de chaque homme est exprimé dans le langage archétypal de Gn 2–3 (...), Paul utilisant le récit d'Adam pour caractériser ce qui est vrai de l'homme (*'adam*) en général – un peu comme 2 Bar 54,19: «Chacun de nous a été l'Adam de sa propre âme»<sup>(70)</sup>.

---

introduction, parallèles, notes et index (SC 245; Paris 1978) I, 86.92.93. Le parallèle avec notre passage est effectué notamment par WILCKENS, *Römer*, II, 79, et par DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 379.

<sup>(67)</sup> On observera encore que, en Gn 3,24, le *Neofiti* ajoute que «la Loi est arbre de vie pour tout homme qui l'étudie et [que] celui qui observe ses préceptes vit et subsiste comme l'arbre de vie dans le monde à venir» (traduction LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque*, 98 et 100). Ce parallèle, effectué par WILCKENS, *Römer*, II, 79, confirme que la thématique du commandement et de la Loi était rattachée non seulement au récit de l'Exode mais aussi à celui des origines.

<sup>(68)</sup> On notera que, en 4 Es 7,11, Adam est stigmatisé pour avoir transgressé les dispositions (*constitutiones*) de Dieu.

<sup>(69)</sup> Ce point est justement reconnu par DUNN, *Romans*, 401. La référence est ainsi à Gn 2,7 et 2,16-17, ce que reconnaissait déjà H. LIETZMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen 1906) 74.

<sup>(70)</sup> DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 383.

Le verset 11 corrobore pareille lecture vu la manière particulière dont il exprime que le péché a saisi l'occasion que lui fournissait l'entrée en scène du commandement pour «me» séduire et «me» tuer grâce à lui (ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία [...] ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν). Le péché endosse ici le rôle du serpent dans le récit des origines, serpent qui séduit la femme (Gn 3,13: ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με) et conduit le premier couple à s'assujettir à la mort en activant la menace brandie par le Créateur en Gn 2,16: «le jour où vous en mangerez, de mort vous mourrez (ἡ δ' ὅν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἅπ' αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε)».

Si la référence adamique est, pour ainsi dire, omniprésente en Rm 7,7-12, elle est plus beaucoup ponctuelle en Rm 7,13-25, puisqu'on ne la trouve qu'au verset 24 et peut-être déjà, mais de manière très implicite, au verset 14<sup>(71)</sup>. Quoi qu'il en soit, dans la mesure où Rm 7,24 et le cri de désespoir qui s'y exprime viennent conclure l'ensemble de la section en «je» et ouvrir sur le cri de délivrance de 7,25a, ils occupent une position stratégique. Ils signalent que l'ensemble du volet négatif de l'argumentation s'applique à tout humain qui, tel Adam, se trouve à l'état de corps mort, prisonnier qu'il est de son corps de mort, dans l'attente de l'acte libérateur et créateur par lequel Dieu peut le doter, en Jésus-Christ, de l'Esprit de vie.

Comme nous l'avons déjà indiqué précédemment, le verset 2 du chapitre 8, avec sa mention de la Loi de l'Esprit de vie qui, en Jésus Christ, a libéré le croyant de la loi du péché et de la mort, peut être lu à son tour comme une référence adamique. «L'Esprit de vie» y assume en effet — comme aux origines l'haleine de vie qui, en bien des endroits, s'était mue en «Esprit de vie»<sup>(72)</sup> — le rôle libérateur du péché et de la mort. Il est ainsi suggéré qu'«être 'en Christ' signifie avoir été radicalement coupé de l'existence ancienne, dominée par le péché, 'en Adam'»<sup>(73)</sup> et que «Christ, en tant que dernier Adam, est l'Esprit donnant la vie (*the life-giving Spirit*)»<sup>(74)</sup>. Scroggs, pour poser

<sup>(71)</sup> Dans ce verset, peut-être l'expression tout à fait spécifique, «vendu au péché (πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν)», évoque-t-elle la figure d'Adam. D. FLUSSER, «Psalms, Hymns and Prayers», *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M.E. STONE) (CRINT II.2; Assen 1984) 56; M. PHILONENKO, «Sur l'expression 'vendu au péché' dans l'Épître aux Romains», *RHR* 203 (1986) 41-52, ont montré que, remontant à Es 50,1, elle trouve un parallèle en *11QPs<sup>a</sup>* 19,9-10, psame non canonique qui fait précisément référence au récit de la Création (l. 4).

<sup>(72)</sup> Voir *supra*, pp. 476-478.

<sup>(73)</sup> B. BYRNE, *Reckoning with Romans* (Wilmington 1986) 149.

<sup>(74)</sup> SCROGGS, *The Last Adam*, 111.



cette dernière affirmation, s'appuyait notamment sur les passages où Paul recourt au verbe ἀνακαίνωω [renouveler: 2 Co 4,16<sup>(75)</sup>] et au concept d'ἀνακαίνωσις [Rm 12,2<sup>(76)</sup>], et sur Ga 5,16-25 où il décrit la vie de l'homme transformé en insistant que le fait que, sous l'impulsion de l'Esprit et non plus de la chair, il porte précisément les fruits de l'Esprit. Le rapprochement que Scroggs opérait demeurerait cependant thématique, sans qu'il puisse réellement se fonder sur des représentations ou des spéculations attachées à la figure d'Adam. Nous espérons avoir montré que de telles représentations existent et étaient ainsi ses propres conclusions.

Ainsi le troisième volet, positif et lui aussi à deux battants (8,1-17 et 8,18-30), de l'argumentation paulinienne s'ouvre-t-il par un nouveau renvoi à la figure d'Adam.

Une fois de plus, le fil de la référence adamique ne va pas se rompre tout au long de cette argumentation.

Au terme de la première section, en Rm 8,17, le retour du thème de la gloire<sup>(77)</sup>, avec l'emploi du verbe συνδοξάζω, pour signifier que les croyants, cohéritiers du Christ, sont appelés à être glorifiés avec lui, évoque une nouvelle fois la thématique adamique<sup>(78)</sup>.

Et, au cours de la dernière unité argumentative, cette thématique va être bien présente, avec une intensité particulière — mais c'est là un fait que nous aurions pu faire valoir en plusieurs endroits déjà — au début et au terme du raisonnement.

Outre trois nouvelles occurrences du thème de la gloire à venir (8,18; 8,21; 8,30), gloire promise (8,18; 8,21) aux enfants de Dieu mais aussi déjà possédée par eux (8,30), gloire qui pouvait être conçue, nous l'avons vu, à l'image de la gloire primitive d'Adam<sup>(79)</sup>, on peut relever deux allusions au récit des origines. La première se trouve en Rm 8,20, où, dans un contexte où est explicitement évoquée la Création (ἡ κτίσις; versets 19.20.21), mention est faite de celui qui l'a assujettie, soumise (τὸν ὑποτάξαντα) à la vanité. On est ainsi implicitement renvoyé à l'épisode de la chute, même si c'est Dieu auquel il est, selon toute vraisemblance, fait référence<sup>(80)</sup>, et ce en des

<sup>(75)</sup> Voir aussi Col 3,10 où allusion est faite manifestement à Gn 1,26-27 et *supra*, n. 56.

<sup>(76)</sup> Voir aussi Tt 3,5 et *supra*, n. 56.

<sup>(77)</sup> Voir *supra*, p. 481.

<sup>(78)</sup> Ainsi notamment DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 464 (et déjà 457).

<sup>(79)</sup> Voir *supra*, p. 484.

<sup>(80)</sup> Tout cela est reconnu notamment par E. GAUGLER, *Der Römerbrief* (Zürich 1945) I, 303; MICHEL, *Römer*, 267; FITZMYER, *Romans*, 508.

termes qui évoquent ceux par lesquels Il soumet toutes choses à Adam selon Gn 1,28. Il est remarquable à cet égard que le verbe ὑποτάσσω soit précisément employé par les versions d'Aquila, de Symmaque et de Théodotion en cet endroit<sup>(81)</sup>. Quant à la seconde allusion, on la trouve en Rm 8,29, où, en écho à Gn 1,26-27 et à l'affirmation selon laquelle Dieu créa l'homme à son image<sup>(82)</sup>, Paul indique que Dieu a conformé les élus (littéralement: les a rendus conformes) à l'image de Son Fils (συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) afin qu'il fût le premier-né d'une multitude de frères.

### III. Synthèse et conclusion

Si l'on reprend le schéma de progression de l'argumentation proposé par J.-N. Aletti en Rm 5–8 et que l'on y intègre, en petits caractères, les différents endroits où affleure la thématique adamique, on parvient au tableau suivant:

*Exorde* (5,1-11)

*Narratio* (5,12-21)

*Propositio principale* (5,20-21)

*Probatio* (6,1–8,30) se déployant en petites unités argumentatives, commandées chacune par une *subpropositio* suivie d'une *probatio* et se répartissant en trois volets successifs (positif, négatif, positif):

Premier volet positif:

*Subpropositio* (6,1-2a) suivie d'une *probatio* (6,2b-14)

Rm 6,4 Référence à la gloire du Père (conçue en lien avec la gloire d'Adam). Motif de la nouveauté de vie lié au thème de la nouvelle création

Rm 6,6 Référence au vieil homme (s'inscrivant dans la thématique des deux Adam)

Rm 6,12 Mention du corps mortel et des désirs (allusions à la chute)

*Subpropositio* (6,15) suivie d'une *probatio* (6,16–7,6 [au sein de laquelle 7,1-6 a une fonction pérorative])

Rm 7,6 Opposition de deux économies: l'ancienneté de la lettre et la nouveauté de l'Esprit

<sup>(81)</sup> DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 471, reconnaît l'allusion à Gn 1,28 sans pour autant l'étayer par le témoignage de ces versions.

<sup>(82)</sup> Outre à Gn 1,26-27, on peut renvoyer encore à Si 17,3; Sg 2,23; TestXII.Naph 2,5; 4 Es 8,44; Hen(sl) 65,2; VitAd(gr) 10,3; 12,1; 33,5; 35,2; VitAd(lat) 14,1-2; 37,3. Ainsi DUNN, *Romans 1–8*, 483.

Second volet négatif:

*Subpropositio* (7,7a) suivie d'une *probatio* (7,7b-12)

- Rm 7,7-25 Paul endosse un «je» gnomique qui englobe le «je» d'Adam
- Rm 7,7 Référence à la convoitise (cf Gn 3,1-7 et ses relectures)
- Rm 7,8-9 Référence au commandement (cf le récit de la chute et ses relectures)
- Rm 7,11 Le péché séducteur et tueur à l'image du serpent des origines

*Subpropositio* (7,13) suivie d'une *probatio* (7,14-25)

- Rm 7,14 Peut-être l'expression «vendu au péché» évoque-t-elle la figure d'Adam? <sup>(83)</sup>
- Rm 7,24 Référence au corps de mort (cf la création d'Adam à l'état de corps mort)

Troisième volet positif:

*Subpropositio* (8,1-2) suivie d'une *probatio* (8,3-17)

- Rm 8,2 Référence à l'Esprit de Vie (cf les relectures de Gn 2,7)
- Rm 8,17 Thème de la gloire (motif de la co-glorification avec le Christ)

*Subpropositio* (8,18) suivie d'une *probatio* (8,19-30)

- Rm 8,20 Allusion à l'épisode de la chute et à Gn 1,28
- Rm 8,21 Référence à la gloire des enfants de Dieu
- Rm 8,29 Allusion à Gn 1,26-27
- Rm 8,30 Nouvelle irruption du motif de la gloire

*Peroratio* (8,31-39)

Ce tableau fait clairement apparaître, nous le croyons, l'importance de la prise en compte des deux références adamiques que nous avons trouvées, à la lumière de 4 Es 3,5, en Rm 7,24 et en Rm 8,2 pour une lecture appropriée des chapitres 5 à 8 de l'épître. De fait, c'est au moment où l'on peut avoir l'impression que cette référence adamique s'est estompée pour ne réapparaître que beaucoup plus tard qu'elle joue tout son rôle. Au tournant de l'argumentation, à l'instant où Paul passe de l'évocation du drame de la condition de tout humain devant Dieu à l'action de grâce que peut lancer le croyant, délivré de son corps de mort par la loi libératrice de l'Esprit de Vie en Jésus-Christ, le Tarsiote fait précisément allusion à la figure d'Adam et à sa destinée, lui qui, créé à l'état de corps mort, avait cependant accédé à la vie par l'Esprit de Vie. Ainsi la référence adamique, présente tout au long de ces quatre chapitres, l'est-elle aussi en leur cœur. Ainsi

<sup>(83)</sup> Voir *supra*, n. 71.

s'avère-t-il aussi que le «je» de Rm 7,7-25, tout comme l'argumentation de Paul dans l'ensemble de Rm 5-8, est délibérément englobant. La référence à la Loi mosaïque ne se fait-elle pas d'ailleurs, nous l'avons vu, en des termes tels que, par-delà le renvoi au Sinaï, une lecture en fonction du récit des origines est possible, si bien que le propos concerne finalement tout homme, le juif d'abord, mais le païen aussi?

Espérons que cette conclusion, qui n'est pas nouvelle, mais qui se trouve ainsi nouvellement étayée à la lumière de la littérature intertestamentaire et de 4 Es 3,5, contribuera à éclairer la lecture de ces chapitres et à inciter d'autres chercheurs à partir en quête d'autres parallèles qui contribueront à leur tour à une meilleure compréhension de l'argumentation paulinienne.

GDRI – Faculté de Théologie Protestante      Christian GRAPPE  
Palais Universitaire – Université Marc Bloch  
F-67084 Strasbourg cedex

#### SUMMARY

4 Es 3,4-5 says that Adam, created with a dead body, has come to life by means of the Spirit of life. This text shows that a twofold allusion to Adam can be discerned in Rm 7,24 and 8,2, where Paul recalls the release brought about by the Spirit of Life by setting free the human being from his body of death. This proves that Paul regularly refers to Adam throughout Rm 5-8. At the same time, it is confirmed that Paul's argument is intentionally comprehensive in that it deals with each human being and goes beyond the Jews.

## The Book of Joshua as a Land Grant

### I. Treaties and Land Grants

The tradition of comparing suzerain-vassal treaties has a long history in analyzing the forms of various biblical texts<sup>(1)</sup>. It may seem to provide a means of access to understanding the structure and purpose of the book of Joshua. Some treaties include boundary lists within a larger context of historical circumstances and agreements between parties, similar to the boundary lists in Joshua 13–19. They provide a background both for the covenant making reports of 8,30–35 and chap. 24, as well as assistance in understanding the form of the latter. However, as will be argued, it is not vassal treaties in general, nor even those that occur with boundary inscriptions, but agreements in the form of land grants that provide the most productive basis for comparison with the biblical form of the book of Joshua<sup>(2)</sup>. Such grants are found throughout the ancient Near East in Hittite, Ugaritic, and Akkadian. Although they have been used as sources for comparisons with biblical covenants of Abraham and David, their

<sup>(1)</sup> See the overviews of the literature in P. KALLUVEETIL, *Declaration and Covenant* (AnBib 88; Rome 1982); D.J. MCCARTHY, *Old Testament Covenant. A Survey of Current Opinions* (Oxford 1972). For a survey of the theology of covenant and the discussion of its appearance in Israel's history, see R. DAVIDSON, "Covenant Ideology in Ancient Israel", *The World of Ancient Israel. Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives* (ed. R.E. CLEMENTS) (Cambridge 1989) 323–347. Any review of this discussion should take into account those who see covenant as a later development, e.g. E.W. NICHOLSON, *God and His People. Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford 1986), as well as the arguments for its early appearance, e.g. K.A. KITCHEN, "The Rise and Fall of Covenant, Law and Treaty", *TynB* 40 (1989) 118–135.

<sup>(2)</sup> Nevertheless, the particular texts of Joshua 23 and especially 24 have been studied in relation to the question of treaty/covenant form: R.S. HESS, "West Semitic Texts and the Book of Joshua", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7 (1997) 63–76, especially 74–75; K.A. KITCHEN, "Egypt, Qatna, and Covenant", *UF* 11 (1979) 453–464; IDEM, "The Rise and Fall of Covenant, Law and Treaty", *TynB* 40 (1989) 118–135; IDEM, "The Patriarchal Age. Myth or History?" *BArR* 21/2 (March/April 1995) 52–56; W.T. KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTSS 93; Sheffield 1990).

form is not fixed (unlike the suzerain-vassal treaties) nor can they be described as unconditional <sup>(3)</sup>.

Thus the understanding of royal land grants does not lie within the larger context of ancient Near Eastern treaties. This appears to be the one point concerning royal grants that has general agreement. Treaties as a whole preserve a fixed structure, whether they occur in the second millennium or first millennium BCE. In all cases the suzerain-vassal treaty begins with a prologue consisting of the self-identification of the suzerain. This is followed at some point by stipulations, by witnesses, and by curses. In the second millennium BCE, the treaties also preserve a historical review after the prologue and a set of blessings after the curses <sup>(4)</sup>. However, there are important differences between treaties and royal grants <sup>(5)</sup>. The former protect the rights of the suzerain whereas the latter preserve the rights of the vassal. Thus the treaty's curses are directed against the rights of the vassal, whereas the curses of the grant are designed for anyone who attempts to violate the vassal's rights that have been guaranteed by the suzerain.

Having established distinctions between treaties and land grants, however, it is not the case that the royal grants of land can be grouped together as the same type. Nor is it true that they possess any necessary relationship with biblical grants such as that of Genesis 12,1-3 (cf. chaps. 13-22), where Abram is promised land and descendants; and 2 Samuel 7, where a perpetual dynasty is given to David and his descendants. For Kalluveetil, the following differences are significant: loyalty is not a prerequisite in the biblical grants but it is in the royal grants; the ancient Near Eastern royal grants establish a deeding of land with the decree, whereas the biblical grants provide a promise of land and dynasty that awaits fulfillment; the promise to Abram is one that occurs in contexts with other promises and concerns and cannot be

<sup>(3)</sup> For comparisons between land grants and biblical covenants, see M. WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East", *JAOS* 90 (1970) 184-203 (for the objections cited here, see p. 185); IDEM, "Addenda to *JAOS* 90 (1970), 184ff.", *JAOS* 92 (1972) 468-469; IDEM, *The Promise of the Land. The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites* (Berkeley, CA 1993) 222-264. G.N. KNOPPERS, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants and the Davidic Covenant: A Parallel?", *JAOS* 116 (1996) 670-697, provides the most comprehensive survey and critique of this comparison.

<sup>(4)</sup> V. KOROŠEC, *Hethitische Staatsverträge*. Ein Beitrag zu ihren juristischen Wertung (Leipziger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien, 60; Leipzig 1931).

<sup>(5)</sup> WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant," 185.

isolated as a separate document<sup>(6)</sup>. Knoppers critiques the connection between royal land grants and the biblical promises to Abram and David<sup>(7)</sup>. He notes that, unlike the treaties, there are neither structures or terms distinctive to ancient Near Eastern royal grants. They are diverse in their form and phrases. Not only are the terms and language irregular in the grants themselves; they are found in texts that are not royal grants. He also observes that the apparent unconditionality of the biblical promises does not always occur in the ancient Near Eastern royal grants. In particular, texts from the West Semitic worlds of Alalakh and Ugarit often attach various demands of loyalty to their grants of land. Yet these might be expected to serve as the models for the West Semitic “grants” to Abram and David.

## II. AT 456

Even the grants from the West Semitic world of Alalakh and Ugarit must be distinguished. Those from Ugarit represent deeds in which the king provides gifts of lands within the city-state to loyal subjects for services rendered. They remain part of the lands of Ugarit and are thus understood as a kind of property exchange, in which the land becomes available for use by the loyal servant. However, one Middle Bronze Age text from Alalakh is exceptional in that its largely preserved text details the gift from one king to another (although a vassal) of a city and its villages and lands in exchange for loyal services rendered in a recent battle. AT 456 is a unique West Semitic cuneiform document that allows the reader to glimpse the literary form of a royal land grant enacted on the scale of an entire city state.

In light of these considerations, we may consider the question of the book of Joshua as a land grant. The book of Joshua has been a source of discussion regarding its form and structure<sup>(8)</sup>. However,

<sup>(6)</sup> KALLUVEETIL, *Declaration and Covenant*, 180 n 234.

<sup>(7)</sup> KNOPPERS, “Ancient Near Eastern”.

<sup>(8)</sup> Much has been written since the classic analysis of a Deuteronomistic redactor constructing etiologies, war accounts, boundary lists, and place name lists into the book of Joshua, as set forth by M. NOTH, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen 1953) 9-16. Although commentaries continue to examine multi-layered strata (cf. V. FRITZ, *Das Buch Josua* [HAT I/7; Tübingen 1994]; R. NELSON, *Joshua A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville 1997]), a variety of literary and linguistic approaches have appeared recently: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, “Arte narrativa en Josué-Jueces-Samuel-Reyes”, *EstBib* 48 (1990) 145-169; D.M. GUNN, “Joshua and Judges”, *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (eds. R. ALTER and

unlike the promises to Abram and David, the text of Joshua does not promise something. Rather, like the royal grants, it claims to record the actual deeding of land to the tribes of Israel, whose vassal status in relation to God is undeniable. Like many of the royal grants, it demands loyalty or faithfulness to the suzerain (chaps. 7-8, 23-24). Further, the book of Joshua exists as a discrete document; not one that is embedded in other contexts. Finally, the book of Joshua is marked by its conditionality in relation to the giving of the land. Israel will receive the land only so long as it faithfully adheres to its suzerain's wishes.

Thus the land grant from Middle Bronze Age Alalakh Level VII, AT 456, provides a unique text that invites comparison in form and purpose with the sixth book of the Hebrew Bible. This is not an arbitrary comparison. Rather, AT 456 is the only royal land grant that: (1) includes the gifts of a major area on the size of a city state, with all its subsidiary lands and villages (rather than a royal grant of a parcel of land or a village such as one finds at Ugarit); (2) is nearly complete in its preserved tablet; and (3) originates in a West Semitic cultural context, i.e. Middle Bronze Age Alalakh. The tablet, found by Sir Leonard Woolley at Tell Atchana and presently housed in the Hatay Museum in Antakya, is a significant example of a land grant whose major structural elements parallel those of the book of Joshua<sup>(9)</sup>.

---

F. KERMODE (Cambridge, MA. 1987) 102-121; L.D. HAWK, *Every Promise Fulfilled*. Contesting Plots in Joshua (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville 1991); R.S. HESS, "Studies in the Book of Joshua", *Themelios* 20/3 (May 1995) 12-15; H.J. KOOREVAAR, *De Opbouw van het Boek Jozua* (Heverlee 1990); G. MITCHELL, *Together in the Land*. A Reading of the Book of Joshua (JSOTSS 134; Sheffield 1993); M. OTTOSSON, *Joswaboken*. En programskrift for davidisk restauration (Acta Universitatis upsalienses, Studia biblica pusaliensia 1; Stockholm 1991); L. ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric of Violence*. A New Historicist Analysis (JSOTSS 226; Sheffield 1996); N. WINTHER-NIELSEN, *A Functional Discourse Grammar of Joshua*. A Computer-Assisted Rhetorical Structure Analysis (ConBOT 40; Stockholm 1995). Recent commentaries that attempt to provide a literary analysis of the book include, among others, L.D. HAWK, *Joshua* (Berit Olam; Collegeville 2000); R.S. HESS, *Joshua*. An Introduction & Commentary (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 6; Downers Grove and Leicester 1996); D.M. HOWARD, JR., *Joshua* (The New American Commentary 5; Nashville 1998). For a competent review of the literature, cf. E. NOORT, *Das Buch Joshua*. Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder (Erträge der Forschung 292; Darmstadt 1998).

<sup>(9)</sup> For the original publication of the copy, transliteration, translation, and comments on the text, see D.J. WISEMAN, "Abban and Alalah", *JCS* 12 (1958) 124-129. Important readings were proposed by A. DRAFFKORN, "Was King Abba-



## 1. AT 456.1-30 and Joshua 1-12

<i>Obverse 1. URU i-ma-ar<sup>KI</sup> qa-du x na-wa<sup>KI</sup></i>	The city of Emar together with its pasture land(?),
2. <i>URU za-a[r-r]a-at<sup>KI</sup> (10)</i>	the towns of Za[rr]at,
3. <i>URU [x - x - x]-na<sup>KI</sup></i>	...na,
4. <i>URU na-aš-tar-bé<sup>KI</sup></i>	Nashtarbe,
5. <i>URU ḥa-aš-na-ap<sup>KI</sup></i>	Ḥashnap,
6. <i>URU ka-az-zu-we<sup>KI</sup></i>	Kazzuwe,
7. <i>URU am-ma-ak-ke<sup>KI</sup></i>	Ammakke,
8. <i>URU pa-ar-re-e</i>	(and) Parrê,
9. <i>a-na [p]u-ḥa-at URU ú-wi-ia-a<sup>KI</sup></i>	in exchange for Uwiye.
10. <i>URU at-ra-te<sup>KI</sup></i>	The town of Atrate
11. <i>a-na pu-ḥa-at e-pí-ri zu-na-a[d]-de<sup>KI</sup></i>	in exchange for the land of the towns of Zunadde,
12. <i>i-ba-aš-šu</i>	which is(?),
13. <i>URU a-ma-me<sup>KI</sup></i>	Amame,
14. <i>[UR]U a-ú-šu-un<sup>KI</sup></i>	Aushun,
15. <i>URU ḥa-al-li-we<sup>KI</sup></i>	Halliwe,
16. <i>URU zi-ki-ir[-li(? )<sup>KI</sup>]</i>	Zikirli(?),
17. <i>URU mu-ra-ar<sup>KI</sup></i>	Murar,
18. <i>URU ir-ri-di<sup>KI</sup> URU ia-ri-im-l[i-im]</i>	and Irride - Yarimlim [ruled them(?)]

Of the 75 lines that are more or less preserved, the first 18 constitute a list of towns. This town list represents places exchanged and ruled by Abbael and his brother Yarimlim. Given the history of conflict and conquest that follows in lines 19-30, it is reasonable to assume that lines 1-18 represent a situation that pertained before the events described in the following lines. Thus these lines form part of a historical record that may be compared with the first twelve chapters

---

An of Yamḥad a Vizier for the King of Ḥattuša?”, *JCS* 13 (1959) 94-97. See also R.S. HESS, “Land Grant AT 456\* (2.137)”, *The Context of Scripture* (eds. W.W. HALLO – K.L. YOUNGER, JR.) (Leiden 2000) II, 369-370. The transliterations of Wiseman and Draffkorn-Kilmer, and the translation of Hess will be followed here. The author is grateful to Professor D.J. Wiseman and to Professors M. Dietrich and O. Loretz for access to their unpublished notes on this text; and to successive directors of the Hatay Museum for permission to collate this text, most recently in March of 1997.

(10) Or Šarbat. For the individual place names, their possible site identifications, and what is known of them from the literature and archaeology, see F. ZEEB, “Die Ortsnamen und geographischen Bezeichnungen der Texte aus Alalah VII”, *UF* 30 (1998) 829-886 (835 for Zarrat). Zeeb’s readings are followed here for these place names.

of Joshua, whose purpose will be noted below in the discussion of lines 19-30. However, these lines may also be compared with Joshua 13-21 insofar as they appear to represent places allotted, at least in part, to Yarimlim.

These towns constitute places acquired and held by different rulers, similar to the town lists of the tribes in Joshua 13-19. Further parallels occur with respect to Joshua 20 and 21<sup>(1)</sup>. These chapters contain the towns of refuge and the towns designated for the Levites. The latter are of special interest in two ways. First, the towns are given, each with their "pasture lands" or, more accurately, "their immediate environs; their outlying districts" (Heb. *migr<sup>u</sup>šêhen*). This term occurs some fifty-seven times in Joshua 21, designating that each of the towns that the Levites possess also includes this additional area. The same expression occurs in Akkadian in the first line of AT 456, URU *i-ma-*

<sup>(1)</sup> For comparisons with chs. 13-21 and ancient Near Eastern town lists and boundary descriptions, see R.S. HESS, "Asking Historical Questions of Joshua 13-19: Recent Discussion Concerning the Date of the Boundary Lists", *Faith, Tradition, History. Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context* (eds. A.R. MILLARD – J.K. HOFFMEIER – D.W. BAKER) (Winona Lake 1994) 191-205; IDEM, "Late Bronze Age and Biblical Boundary Descriptions of the West Semitic World", *Ugarit and the Bible. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible. Manchester, September 1992* (eds. G. BROOKE – A. CURTIS – J. HEALEY) (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur Band 11; Münster 1994) 123-138; IDEM, "A Typology of West Semitic Place Name Lists with Special Reference to Joshua 13-21", *BA* 59/3 (September 1996) 160-170; C.R. KRAHMALKOV, "Exodus Itinerary Confirmed by Egyptian Evidence", *BAR* 20/5 (September/October 1994) 54-62, 79; M. WEINFELD, "The Pattern of the Israelite Settlement in Canaan", *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 40; Brill 1988) 270-283; IDEM, "Historical Facts behind the Israelite Settlement Pattern", *VT* 38 (1988) 324-332; IDEM, *The Promise of the Land*, 22-51. Of special interest is the work of A.M. KITZ, "Undivided Inheritance and Lot Casting in the Book of Joshua", *JBL* 119 (2000) 601-618. While her study on lot casting provides illuminating parallels with the relevant Joshua texts, the relation of Sumerian inheritance texts raises some questions. These texts demonstrate several similarities between the concepts and forms of the land division, especially chaps. 18-19, and implicitly provide a rationale for the first half of the book as a means to clear the land of unwanted "squatters". However, (1) specifics of the form vary considerably in appearance and sequence, (2) there is no parallel with these texts in the West Semitic world (3) nor with the use of lot casting to dissolve undivided inheritance, (4) there is an absence of key phrases such as "dwell together," and (5) the theological overlay of a strong emphasis upon God's part in "clearing" the land as well as the conditional nature of the gift of the land to Israel (23,12-13) cast doubt upon inheritance texts as a key to understanding the conquest, allotment, covenant, and oath swearing in the book of Joshua.

ar (KI) *qa-du-um na-we-šu* “The town of Emar together with its outlying districts”<sup>(12)</sup>. Thus the town lists in both texts use a similar expression to describe the extent of the gift of land. Second, there is the sense described by the twofold occurrence of *a-na pu-ḥa-at* “in exchange for; as a substitute for,” in lines 9 and 11. The idea seems to be that these towns form part of an exchange of some sort between two individuals<sup>(13)</sup>. A similar situation occurs in Joshua 21 where the Israelites return some of the towns divinely given to them. The Levites receive these towns that form part of the exchange that Joshua describes. The other tribes receive their land in exchange for a return of part of that land in the form of the towns for the Levites<sup>(14)</sup>.

19. <i>'zi-it-ra-a-du ḥa-za-an-nu ša [ir-ri-di([<sup>k</sup>])]</i>	Zitraddu, the governor of [Irridi],
20. <i>[a]-jna ia-ri-im-li-im il-li-ik[-ma]</i>	revolted against Yarimlim and
21. <i>pa-ni mu-uš-na-a-du ḥa-ab-ba-t[im] iṣ-b[a-a]t(?)</i>	[then he sei]zed(?) robber bands(?)
22. <i>[a]-na URU ir-ri-di<sup>ki</sup> URU.KI-šu ú-[še]-ri-ib-šu-ma</i>	and brought them to Irridi, his city.
23. <i>[ma]-ja(?) -tam ka-la-ša it-ti ab-ba-[A]N LU[GAL] ù</i>	(23-24) He incited the whole land to rebel against Abbael
24. <i>ú-ša-ak-ki-ir-ma i-na ta-a[r(?)]...</i>	The mighty weapon...
25. <i>ù ka-ak-ki-im da-an-ni-im [. . .]</i>	with silver, gold, lapis lazuli, crystal(?), and the great [wea]pon
26. <i>i-na kaspim ḥurāšim uqnêṁ dušim ù [ka-ak-]ki-im</i>	of the weather god. (As for Abbael,) he seized Irridi and destroyed the enemy bands(?).
27. <i>ra-bi-im ša <sup>4</sup>IM URU ir-ri-di<sup>k</sup>[<sup>i</sup>] iṣ-ba-at-ma</i>	To Aleppo
28. <i>iḫ-te-pí ù mu-uš-na-a-du a-ia-bi-šu</i>	he returned in peace.
29. <i>iṣ-ša-ba-at a-na URU ḥa-la-ab<sup>ki</sup></i>	
30. <i>i-na šu-ul-mi-im i-tu-ra-am-ma</i>	

Lines 19-30 record the historical circumstances that establish the destruction of Yarimlim's city and the manner in which Abbael gained back the lands that had revolted against his rule. This historical

<sup>(12)</sup> DRAFFKORN, “Was King Abba-An”, 94 note 3; CAD N1, XI, 250. See also J. BARR, “*migrāš* in the Old Testament”, JSS 29 (1984) 15-31; HESS, *Joshua*, 280-283; and Alalakh Text 56, which also mentions this term in an allotment.

<sup>(13)</sup> DRAFFKORN, “Was King Abba-An”, 94 note 6, surmises that the indentation of the phrase in lines 9 and 11 means that it refers only to those towns listed above and prior to the phrase, not to the towns of lines 13-18.

<sup>(14)</sup> See HESS, *Joshua*, 277: “Chapters 20-21 appear after the tribal allotments because they represent a second phase in the land grants. Firstly, God gave the Promised Land to Israel (chs. 13-19). Secondly, Israel gave back some of this land, setting it aside for specific purposes” .

perspective establishes the circumstances in which Abbael was able to hand over the grant of the city of Alalakh to his brother Yarimlim. Chapters 1–12 of Joshua provide a similar perspective. They also describe the necessary events of warfare that led Israel to a context where it could receive its allotment. Of special interest is the sense in which God, as the giver, fights for Israel and thereby does the primary work of destroying and driving out the inhabitants, and giving Israel the land (6,2-21; 8,1-2; 10,11-14.30.32.42; 11,6-8.20)<sup>(15)</sup>. The nation receives the land as it enters and takes possession of what God has given.

The gifts of the city of Alalakh and the additional town of Murar are a reward for the loyalty of Yarimlim. There is no mention of Yarimlim's activity in the war; only that of Abbael and the enemy, Zitradu. Although the circumstances described are entirely different, this resembles Joshua 1–12<sup>(16)</sup>. God gives the enemies and their land

<sup>(15)</sup> HESS, *Joshua*, 44, 46-47.

<sup>(16)</sup> There has been much discussion on the forms of Joshua 1–12. For chaps. 1–5, whose forms have been analyzed mainly in terms of biblical and West Semitic mythic parallels, see F.M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel (Cambridge, MA 1973) 103-105; J. A. WILCOXEN, "Narrative Structure and Cult Legend: A Study of Joshua 1-6", *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship* (ed. J.C. RYLAARSDAM) (Essays in Divinity 6; Chicago 1968) 43-70; N. WINTHER-NIELSEN, "The Miraculous Grammar of Joshua 3-4", *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. R.D. BERGEN) (Dallas – Winona Lake 1994) 300-319.

For chs. 6–12, whose forms resemble ancient Near Eastern themes, conquest accounts, and ideologies, see D.E. FLEMING, "The Seven-Day Siege of Jericho in Holy War", *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine* (eds. R. CHAZAN – W.W. HALLO – L.H. SCHIFFMAN) (Winona Lake 1999) 211-228; R.S. HESS, "Joshua 1-12 as a Centrist Document", "Dort ziehen Schiffe dahin...", Collected Communications to the XIVth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Paris 1992 (eds. M. AUGUSTIN – K.-D. SCHUNCK) (BEAT 28; Frankfurt am Main 1996) 53-67; IDEM, "Non-Israelite Personal Names in the Book of Joshua", *CBQ* 58 (1996) 205-214; IDEM, "Rhetorical Forms in Joshua 10:4", "Und Moses schrieb dieses Lied auf". Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen (eds. M. DIETRICH – I. KOTTSIEPER) (Münster 1998) 363-367; IDEM, "Joshua 10 and the Sun that Stood Still", *Buried History* 35/1 (1999) 26-33; J.K. HOFFMEIER, "The Structure of Joshua 1-11 and the Annals of Thutmose III", *Faith, Tradition, and History*, 165-179; D. MERLING, SR., *The Book of Joshua*. Its Theme and Role in Archaeological Discussions (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 23; Berrien Springs 1996); A.R. MILLARD, "Back to the Iron Bed: Og's or Procrustes?", *Congress Volume: Paris: 1992* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS 61; Leiden 1995) 193-203; J. VAN SETERS, "Joshua's Campaign of Canaan and Near Eastern Historiography", *SJOT* 4 (1990)

into the hands of Israel. This key idea of the land as a gift is affirmed before and sometimes during every major conflict<sup>(17)</sup>. The emphasis is upon the work of God. Although Joshua and Israel are mentioned, they are merely witnesses who view the work of God and reap the benefits of divine gifts. The same is true of Yarimlim and his lack of direct involvement in the war, at least as related in the text. The focus is upon Abbael who makes the cities a gift to Yarimlim. It is not the burning of Yarimlim's former city, or any acts of loyalty that he might have accomplished in the battle, that formed the basis for the gift. Rather, it is Abbael's own work and subsequent generosity that receives the emphasis, both in terms of the battle and the subsequent gifts of Alalakh and Murar.

Some specific points of comparison have to do with this battle account and those found in Joshua 10 and 11, the southern and northern campaigns. In all cases the battle account begins by naming the chief enemy and the town that he governs: Zitraddu of Irridi (AT 456.19), Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem (Josh 10,1), Jabin of Hazor (Josh 11,1). In all cases this is followed by an incitement by the enemy that brings others into the battle (AT 456.23-24; Josh 10,3-5; 11,1-4). In both AT 456.25-27 and Josh 10,11 divine weapons are mentioned that have meteorological associations, either with the weather deity or with stones from heaven.

A further point of parallel has to do with the final line in this section of the Alalakh text. It describes how there was peace in the land at the end of the battle. The same idea occurs in Josh 11,23, after the last battle in the book. This description of the land as possessing "rest" from war contains the first use of the root, *šqt*, in the biblical text.

## 2. AT 456.31-39a and Joshua 13-21

31.URU ir-ri-di! <sup>KI</sup> -mi-i KI ḥe-pé-em	<He said;> "Irridi is destroyed.
32.a-na a-ḥi-ia a-na-ad-di-in	Will I give it to my brother?
33.[a]-na pu-ḥa-at URU ir-ri-di <sup>KI</sup>	In exchange for Irridi
34.[ša it-ti-]šu ik-ki-ru[-ú.-ma]	[that] rebelled [against] him
35.[aš-bat-t]u-ma e[ḥ-pu-ú]	[and that I captur]ed and d[estroyed,]
36.[URU a-la-l]a-aḥ <sup>KI</sup> . . .]	[Alal]akh
37.[a-na ia]-ri-im-li-i[m a-na-ad-di-in]	[I will give to Ya]rimlim.

1-12; K.L. YOUNGER, JR., *Ancient Conquest Accounts. A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing* (JSOTSS 98; Sheffield 1990).

(17) Cf. Josh 1,3; 6,2; 8,1; 10,8, 11, 30, 32; 11,6.

38.ù URU mu-ra-ar<sup>kl</sup> e-li zi-i[t-ti-šu]

The town of Murar, in addition to  
[his shar]e,

39a. ú-ri-id-di-šu

I will add to it.”

The mention of the allocation of these cities to Yarimlim forms the next part of AT 456. Thus lines 31-39a resemble the allotments of Joshua 13–21. Although they are much more detailed in the biblical text, they nevertheless form a parallel element. Both texts name specific places as a gift that the chief leader who has won the battle gives to the loyal ally. While it is true that some of the texts in Joshua 13–21 preserve boundary descriptions, these are clearly not the only texts in these chapters. They do not occur for every tribe nor are they always complete when they do occur<sup>(18)</sup>. There is therefore a larger context to the boundary descriptions and town lists than marking specific boundaries for the inheritances of the various tribes. That context is best understood in terms of a land grant document such as AT 456. This document does not necessarily preserve specific boundaries, but is concerned to list the towns that are given to the recipient. The same is true of the towns listed in Joshua. In virtually every case both the town lists and the boundary descriptions utilize population centers in assigning allotments.

Although the biblical lists provide names of actual places and may have served juridical purposes at some time in Israel’s history, they are not composed without regard to literary structure. The comprehensive and precise form of the first allotment named west of the Jordan River, that of Judah in Joshua 15, contrasts with the less well structured and sketchier allotment descriptions of the tribes as one moves further along in the chapters (Joshua 16–19) and proceeds north in the geography. This has led to various observations about the priority of Judah and the implicit criticism of the northern tribes<sup>(19)</sup>.

There may also be conscious literary formation at work in the parallel section of the land grant of Alalakh. Only Alalakh and Murar are given to Yarimlim. Although Alalakh is depicted as Yarimlim’s share (*zi-i[t-ti-šu]*), Murar is a gracious, additional gift to the loyal brother. This is suggested by the final word in the Abbael’s promise, *ú-ri-id-di-šu*, “I shall add it.” It is perhaps more than coincidental that the

<sup>(18)</sup> This point should not be overlooked. The presence of boundary lists in texts of the West Semitic world can be found in treaties, but also occur in house and property sale contracts, as at Emar. See HESS, “Late Bronze Age”.

<sup>(19)</sup> HAWK, *Every Promise Fulfilled*, 102-113; HESS, *Joshua*, 238-239; MITCHELL, *Together in the Land*, 108; OTTOSSON, *Josuboken*.

first word in this section, the name of the destroyed city that Yarimlim formerly ruled, URU *ir-ri-di* (KI), sounds like the final word, *ú-ri-id-di-šu* “I will add to it”. This word play forms an envelope around the central allotment in the text, and it provides a literary connection between the destroyed city and the supplemental gift that Yarimlim adds to the bestowal of Alalakh. Compare this with the note on Joshua’s advanced age that appears at the beginning of the allotment in Josh 13,1 and recurs after the allotment is finished as the first verse of chap. 23. This also provides a literary envelope for the account of the allotment of the land. Although dealing with completely different subject matter, the two envelope constructions frame these key sections as literary boundaries that define the allotted territories named between them.

### 3. AT 456.39b-62 and Joshua 22,1–24,15 [also vv. 16-27]

39b-42<sup>(20)</sup>. Abbael swore the oath to Yarimlim and cut the neck of a lamb, <saying:> “If I take back what I have given you <may I be cursed.>”

43-50a. If ever in the future Yarimlim sins against Abbael, or [if] he gives away Abbael’s secret to another king, or if he lets go of the hem of Abbael’s garment and grasps the hem of another king’s garment, his towns and lands he shall [forfeit].

50b-57a. If a descendant of Yarimlim sins against Abbael (or a descendant of Abbael), if he rel[ease]s the h[em] of Abbael’s garment, (or that of a descendant of Abbael), and if he seizes the hem of another king’s garment, his towns and lands he shall forfeit.

57b-62. If a descendant of [Y]arimlim [tries to] sell his town their older brother shall bu[y it] and give it to a descendant of Abbael. He shall not give it to another person.

Lines 39b-62 constitute the remainder of the unbroken text and describe an agreement in which the two parties slaughter a lamb and bind themselves by oaths in which the grant of the cities to Yarimlim becomes conditional, based upon the loyalty of this man to his brother. Although the slaughtering of the lamb may have parallels elsewhere in the Bible, no direct parallel exists in the book of Joshua<sup>(21)</sup>. It is perhaps of interest that the description of the altar built by the Transjordan tribes was misunderstood as serving the purpose of offerings and animal sacrifices (chap. 22,23-29), and that this is soon

<sup>(20)</sup> For this general translation, see HESS, “Land Grant,” 370.

<sup>(21)</sup> On the question of the legitimacy of comparisons that have been made, see R.S. HESS, “The Slaughter of the Animals in Genesis 15:18-21 and Its Ancient Near Eastern Context”, *He Swore an Oath. Biblical Themes from Genesis 12-50* (eds. R.S. HESS – P.E. SATTERTHWAITHE – G.J. WENHAM) (Cambridge 1993) 55-65.

followed by Joshua's own covenant making ceremony (Josh 24,1-15 [also vv. 16-27]), itself related to the earlier covenant making act in the same place where sacrifices occurred (8,30-31)<sup>(22)</sup>. Thus the association of animal sacrifices with sealing an agreement does appear in Joshua and has allusions in the final chapters after the allotments.

The actual agreements in both AT 456 and Joshua 23-24 contain two groups of exhortations to loyalty (AT 456 lines 43-49a, 50b-55; Josh 23,6-11; 24,14-15) followed in every case by warnings of losing the gifts given if there is disloyalty (AT 456 lines 49b-50a; 56-57a; Josh 23,12-13; 24,20)<sup>(23)</sup>.

43-49a. If ever in the future Yarimlim sins against Abbael, or [if] he gives away Abbael's secret to another king, or if he lets go of the hem of Abbael's garment and grasps the hem of another king's garment,

49b-50a. his towns and lands he shall [forfeit].

50b-55. If a descendant of Yarimlim sins against Abbael (or a descendant of Abbael), if he rel[ease]s the h[em] of Abbael's garment, (or that of a descendant of Abbael), and if he seizes the hem of another king's garment,

51b-57a. his towns and lands he shall forfeit.

It is significant that there are two sets in both texts. In the Alalakh grant, the first set addresses Yarimlim while the second one deals with his descendants. Yet these two addressees are not as distinctive as may first appear. Both exhortations identify the subject in relation to Yarimlim and both refer to the future. Thus *šum-ma ur-ra-am še-ra-am 'ia-ri-im-li[-im]* "If ever in the future, Yarimlim," is not unlike *šum-ma wa-ar-ki-it 'ia-ri-im-li-i[m]* "If a descendant of Yarimlim." As in

<sup>(22)</sup> Cf. HESS, "The Slaughter of the Animals"; A. MALAMAT, "A Note on the Ritual of Treaty Making in Mari and the Bible", *IEJ* 45 (1995) 226-229.

<sup>(23)</sup> On the conditionality of the Alalakh grant, see KNOPPERS, "Ancient Near Eastern Royal Grants", 686. The Akkadian of 43-50a is: *šum-ma ur-ra-am še-ra-am 'ia-ri-im-li[-im] a-na ab-ba-AN ú-ḫa-aṭ-ṭú-ú!-ma!* [*šum-ma a*]-*wa-tam ab-ba-AN i-qa-ab-bu-šum ú-še-[iṣ]-sú-ú šum-ma qa-ra-an TÚG ab-ba-AN ú-wa-aš-ša-ru-ma qa-ra-an TÚG LUGAL ša-ni-im i-ša-ab-ba-tu i-na URU.KI.ḪÀ ù e-pè-ri it-[ta-aṣ-ṣi]*. The Akkadian of 50b-57a is: *ù šum-ma wa-ar-ki-it 'ia-ri-im-li-i[m] a-na ab-ba-AN ù wa-ar-ki-it ab-ba-AN ú-ḫa-aṭ-ṭú-š[u(?)]-ma(?)* [*š*]*šum-ma qa-ra-an TÚG ab-ba-AN ù qa-r[a-an] TÚG wa-ar-ki-it ab-ba-AN ú-wa-[aš-ša-ru]-ma [q]a-ra-an TÚG LUGAL ša-ni-im i-ša-a[b-ba-tu] [i-na] URU.KI.ḪÀ-šu ù e-pè-ri-š[u] [it]-ta-aṣ-ṣi*. The transliteration follows DRAFFKORN, "Was King Abban-AN," and WISEMAN, "Abban".



Joshua, so in the Alalakh text, the emphasis lies upon both the present generation and future generations of those who benefit by the grant. The same “sin” or disloyalty is also repeated in both Alalakh clauses, using similar idioms.

In the book of Joshua, the first group constitutes the main part of Joshua’s charge to Israel in chap. 23, while the second section appears at the end of the covenant description of chap. 24 and occurs as a dialogue with Israel who insist on affirming their loyalty (vv. 16-18. 21.22.24). In both cases, however, the double exhortation and warning serve to reinforce the importance of the stipulations and the conditional nature of the gift that has just been given. This observation is true regardless of the possibly different origins for Joshua 23 and 24. The similarity of expressions in both Alalakh exhortations may suggest that these texts are not original with their document, either. In both cases, however, the repetition of the charge and warning serves rhetorically to emphasize the exhortation to loyalty.

#### 4. AT 456.68-76 and Joshua 24,16-33

The final lines of AT 456, lines 68-76, appear on the upper and lower edges of the tablet. They include a list of witnesses to the land grant and agreement, as well as the fact that Yarimlim was caused to swear divine oaths (lines 75-76, *ni-iš ilāni* (MEŠ) *ú-ša-az-ki-ru*). As customary as this may be for agreements, it is nevertheless of note that this parallels one of the final sections in the last chapter of the book of Joshua. There the people agree with Joshua that they are witnesses against themselves to observe the clauses of the covenant (Josh 24,22). Their statements on loyalty take on the character of oaths before God, using the customary language of sworn promises, “far be it from me” (Heb. *ḥālilāh*) and the asseverative *kî*, “surely” (Josh 24,16.21). The point is that both texts include witnesses and oaths to further enforce the land grant and the promises of the recipient regarding loyalty.

### III. Conclusion

If the town list in the first 18 lines of the preserved text of AT 456 forms part of the historical background that continues through line 30, then this land grant resembles the book of Joshua in every major part of its structure: (1) a narrative background explaining the circumstances leading to the allotment; (2) the allotment itself with mention of specific towns and recipients; (3) the repeated stipulations

requiring loyalty from the grant recipient to the grantor, coupled with warnings of the loss of the grant for disloyalty; and (4) witnesses and oaths to enforce the agreement.

This correlation with an ancient Near Eastern text provides the clearest and most complete similarities with major features of the book of Joshua. Of course, a single text, such as AT 456, does not establish a genre. Indeed, the diversity of forms in land grants has been demonstrated. Land grants that bestowed towns and cities were unusual, especially in West Semitic archives. However, the proximity of forms between this text and Joshua remains too close to be coincidental. AT 456 provides the only West Semitic example of a royal grant that includes the outright gift of cities and towns while preserving a conditionality and other aspects of a distinctive style of land grant, one found elsewhere only in the book of Joshua.

This comparison provides a comprehensive and pre-deuteronomistic form in which to situate the book of Joshua. However, the rarity of this “form” and its sporadic appearance can demonstrate little about the overall date of the book or the incorporation of this form as a structuring device. The pattern of Joshua as a land grant document may have been received by the deuteronomist and incorporated into the larger history as it now appears. The structure of the book of Joshua provides a formal basis for the theological presentation of the book of Joshua as one in which the nation of Israel received its long promised land as a gift from God and as part of a covenant that preserved that people’s unique relationship with its God and affirmed the requirement of God’s sole lordship over his people.

Denver Seminary  
P.O. Box 100.000 – Denver, CO (USA)

Richard S. HESS

#### SUMMARY

Despite a variety of attempted identifications of the book of Joshua, or portions of it, with other ancient Near Eastern legal documents, the form of the royal land grant remains the closest of those studied in terms of structure and content. In particular, the form of this type of document, as illustrated in the archive of the Middle Bronze Age site of Alalakh, provides an important and useful set of parallels with those found in the sixth book of the Bible. The essay considers the strengths and weaknesses of identifying the book of Joshua in this manner, as well as its implications for the interpretation of the book. In addition, the origin of these documents in the West Semitic world invites consideration of a specific genre or literary type that flourished in those cultures and perhaps provided a link for related documents in the Mesopotamian and Mediterranean worlds.

## **The Measuring of the Sanctuary Reconsidered (Rev 11,1-2)(\*)**

The plethora of commentaries and books on Revelation, and their lack of consensus in virtually everything, is a powerful witness to the difficulty of interpreting John's symbols and images, which often have their background in the OT. Yet there are no formal quotations in Revelation, but rather these OT images and motifs have been frequently shaped and combined by John in such a way that the resulting allusions to the OT can be very elusive and subtle. A case in point is Revelation 11,1-13, which has often been cited as the most difficult pericope in the whole book<sup>(1)</sup>.

The present task, however, is not to solve once and for all every riddle in this difficult passage. Rather, this study will be looking at vv. 1-2 only. The primary focus will be on the act of measuring, with everything else receiving a rather cursory treatment. The essay will challenge the popular scholarly view that measuring the sanctuary and casting out the "outer court" symbolizes spiritual protection but physical vulnerability for the Church<sup>(2)</sup>. First, the traditional

(\*) The following is a revised version of a paper read at the Annual Seminar on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament in Hawarden, North Wales, in March 2002.

(1) See, e.g., J. ROLOFF, *The Revelation of John* (Minneapolis 1993) 122; R.H. MOUNCE, *The Book of Revelation* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1998) 211; B.M. METZGER, *Breaking the Code*. Understanding the Book of Revelation (Nashville 1993) 68; and P. PRIGENT, *L'Apocalypse de saint Jean* (Geneva 2000) 260.

(2) Two presuppositions and one limitation of this essay need to be mentioned: First, with the majority of commentators I am assuming that *ναός* does not refer to a literal, physical sanctuary, and therefore I primarily interact with those views that understand the sanctuary in one way or another symbolically. Second, I recognize the complex issue of John's biblical texts, but here I simply assume that he had an access to Hebrew and Greek texts similar to our MT and Rahlfs' LXX. Finally, while I acknowledge the close connection of vv. 1-2 with chapter 10, and with the rest of the chapter 11 in particular, and with the whole book in general, I nevertheless cannot deal with most of those links here. For treatments of the general structure of Revelation, see, e.g., E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, "Composition and Structure of the Book of Revelation", *CBQ* 39 (1977) 344-366; R. BAUCKHAM, *The Climax of Prophecy*. Studies on the Book of Revelation (Edinburgh 1993) 2-22; A.J.P. GARROW, *Revelation* (London 1997) 14-65; and G.K. BEALE, *The Book of Revelation*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Carlisle 1999) 108-151.

interpretation of the passage is analyzed and some of its problems are highlighted (I). Next, the OT “measuring” passages normally invoked in support of the traditional view will be examined (II), and, finally, a more nuanced understanding of the act of measuring, together with a fresh reading of Rev 11,1-2, will be proposed (III).

### I. The traditional view

The NIV reflects well the way the command to John in Rev 11,1-2 is normally understood:

Go and measure the temple of God and the altar, and count the worshipers there. But exclude the outer court; do not measure it, because it has been given to the Gentiles.

Given the many different interpretations of these two verses, commentators are surprisingly unanimous in explaining how the act of measuring signifies security or protection<sup>(3)</sup>. Thus the sanctuary (or “temple”, as the NIV has it)<sup>(4)</sup>, the altar and the worshipers are protected by measuring, whereas the “outer court” remains vulnerable.

<sup>(3)</sup> So, e.g., D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 6–16* (WBC 52b; Nashville 1998) 604; BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 269, 272; BEALE, *Commentary*, 558-564; G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids 1974) 181; E.M. BORING, *Revelation* (Louisville 1989) 143; R.A. BRIGGS, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (New York 1999) 28, n. 85; G.B. CAIRD, *The Revelation of St John the Divine* (London 1984) 131; R.H. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (ICC; Edinburgh 1920) I, 274; A. FARRER, *A Rebirth of Images. The Making of St. John’s Apocalypse* (Boston 1963) 121 (though cf. 44); GARROW, *Revelation*, 73; MOUNCE, *Revelation*, 213-215; F.J. MURPHY, *Fallen Is Babylon. The Revelation to John* (Harrisburg, PA 1998) 259; J.L. RESSEGUIE, *Revelation Unsealed. A Narrative Critical Approach to John’s Apocalypse* (Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998) 92; ROLOFF, *Revelation*, 129; E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *The Book of Revelation. Justice and Judgment* (Philadelphia 1985) 77; J.P.M. SWEET, *Revelation* (London 1979) 183; and H.B. SWETE, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (London 1906) 130. A slight variation of this is to explain measuring as marking a division between the holy and the profane (which is then taken to indicate divine protection); e.g., D. CHILTON, *The Days of Vengeance. An Exposition of the Book of Revelation* [Ft. Worth 1987] 273; and W. HENDRIKSEN, *More than Conquerors* [London 1962] 126). For C. ROWLAND, *Revelation* (London 1993) 99, the measuring of the sanctuary “symbolizes the present, limited extent of the divine possession in a world where the rebellious nations are in apparent control”.

<sup>(4)</sup> On the use of the term in the NT, see O. MICHEL, “ναός”, *TDNT* IV, 882-887.

This vulnerability is then frequently interpreted to mean that the Church is protected “spiritually”, but will be exposed “physically”<sup>(5)</sup>.

However, this view, although attractive and commonly accepted, raises both lexical and interpretive questions. While we perhaps should not expect too much of John in terms of his Greek, it is nevertheless worth investigating whether at least some of the following lexical questions can be resolved without recourse to the peculiarities of John’s language.

### 1. *Lexical Issues*

First, the verb μετρέω in this context — whatever its figurative meaning may be — clearly means taking the spatial dimensions of something<sup>(6)</sup>. The sanctuary and the court outside the sanctuary can be measured, and possibly even the altar, but the worshipers cannot thus be measured (or at least it would be very odd). Three solutions have been offered to this problem. One is exemplified in the NIV where μετρέω is translated twice but with two different senses, the latter being “to count”<sup>(7)</sup>. This would be similar to saying something like, “He missed the point and the train” in English. Yet it would seem that “counting” the worshipers only compounds the complexity of the passage<sup>(8)</sup>. Another solution sometimes invoked is that this is an instance of *zeugma*, a special type of ellipsis, where “one verb is used with two objects... but suits only one”<sup>(9)</sup>. However, in the case of *zeugma*, the missing verb is usually either self-evident or supplied from the immediate context, neither of which necessarily applies here. Again, even if we follow Swete and supply a verb such as καταριθμέω, we are merely turning a lexical difficulty into an exegetical one<sup>(10)</sup>. The third and always available alternative is to

<sup>(5)</sup> For a summary of this and three other symbolic interpretations, see AUNE, *Revelation*, 597-598; cf. BEALE, *Commentary*, 557-559.

<sup>(6)</sup> Louw-Nida, 81.2; BDAG, 643.1. It can also be used in the sense of “to give a measured portion to someone”, Louw-Nida, 57.92; BDAG, 643.2.

<sup>(7)</sup> Though unlikely, this sense is not entirely impossible, as it is attested in Alcaeus some 700-800 years before John, and in Theocritus some 400 years before John (*LSJ*, 1122. III.1).

<sup>(8)</sup> The proponents of this solution do not normally explain why the worshipers should be counted and how their counting contributes to the overall picture.

<sup>(9)</sup> BDF §479.2; so, e.g., R.L. THOMAS, *Revelation 8–22*. An Exegetical Commentary (Chicago 1995) 82; AUNE, *Revelation*, 605; and SWETE, *Apocalypse*, 130.

<sup>(10)</sup> Ibid.

acknowledge the problem but to treat it only as an indication of the symbolic nature of John's language<sup>(11)</sup>.

Another lexical problem is the verb ἐκβάλλω, especially together with ἔξωθεν or ἔξω. That phrase in the NT always refers to people who are expelled or driven out<sup>(12)</sup>. Even though John possibly meant the "outer court" to symbolize people, the case remains that if ἔκβαλε here refers *only* to the "outer court", it stands as the sole example of such usage in the NT<sup>(13)</sup>. It may perhaps be objected that the phrase "cast outside" is found twice in the LXX (in Lev 14,40 and in 2 Chr 29,16), where it is not referring to people. However, this objection is not as serious as appears at first, as we will see later.

<sup>(11)</sup> So, e.g., BEALE, *Commentary*, 560.

<sup>(12)</sup> E.g., Matt 21,39; Luke 13,28; and John 6,37. See also AUNE, *Revelation*, 607; and J.M. FORD, *Revelation* (AB 38; Garden City, NY 1975) 169, 176. BAGD (237; 3) lists Rev 11,2 as an exception to the normal usage of the word, but that position seems to derive its support from the traditional interpretation of the verse rather than from the lexical data. BDAG (299) has added a fourth meaning for ἐκβάλλω, "to pay no attention", of which Rev 11,2 is listed not only as the only biblical example, but as the only example in early Christian literature where ἐκβάλλω with accusative has this meaning; cf. LSJ (501), which primarily has people as the objects of "casting out" and knows nothing about the fourth meaning suggested by BDAG.

SWEET, *Revelation*, 184, points out that ἐκβάλλω without ἔξωθεν or ἔξω is used by Jesus who told his disciples to ask the Lord to send out (ἐκβάλλῃ) workers into his harvest field (Matt 9,38; Luke 10,2). He suggests that the casting out of the outer court and the trampling by the nations may indicate the Church's mission to the Gentiles (Matt 10,17-18; 24,9-14). Moreover, ἔκβαλε ἔξω[θεν] "also hints at the results of bearing witness" (Matt 21,39/Mark 12,8/Luke 20,15; Luke 4,29; John 9,34; Acts 7,58), thus perhaps connecting Rev 11,1-2 to the mission of the two witnesses. However, while interesting, Sweet's proposal has two weaknesses: First, ἔκβαλε ἔξω[θεν] in itself does not have this meaning, even though in some cases the casting out has been a result of bearing witness to God or Jesus. The phrase simply means "cast outside" or "drive out", and can be used in very different contexts. For example, in John 12,31 it refers to Satan, who is cast out as a result of God's judgment; in Luke 13,28 it refers to those who think they belong to the people of God but are cast out of the Kingdom of God; and in John 6,37 it refers to those who come to Jesus and therefore will not be cast out. Second, the examples he gives describe the *result* of the "witness" rather than the cause of it, as his reading of the trampling by the nations and the commission of the two witnesses suggests.

<sup>(13)</sup> For a different solution to the difficult phrase, καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν, see BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 270-273; cf. the criticism in AUNE, *Revelation*, 607.

## 2. Interpretive Issues

There are also interpretive problems. For example, the “court outside the sanctuary” is frequently explained to refer to the court of the Gentiles of the Herodian temple<sup>(14)</sup>. It is not clear, however, why this should be the case, since there were three other courts also outside the sanctuary but within the court of the Gentiles, namely, the court of the priests, the court of Israel, and the court of women. What is the fate of these other courts within the traditional schema? The same question can be asked of those who understand John to have had in mind the outer court of Ezekiel’s temple<sup>(15)</sup>, for there, too, the court outside the sanctuary was located within the outer court. Furthermore, if Rev 11,1-2 is indeed modeled after Ezekiel’s prophecy in chapters 40–48, one would need to explain why John is suggesting that part of the eschatological temple will be defiled by the nations, when Ezekiel’s point seems to be exactly the opposite<sup>(16)</sup>.

But there are other interpretive problems. Τὸ θυσιαστήριον with the definite article and without further qualification normally refers to the altar of burnt offering, located in the court outside the sanctuary<sup>(17)</sup>. But why would it be protected, if we grant that the “sanctuary” is symbolizing the Church? Indeed, why mention the altar and the worshipers at all? The measuring of the sanctuary and the casting out of the “outer court” would have been enough to portray the Church as

<sup>(14)</sup> So, e.g., BEASLEY-MURRAY, *Revelation*, 182; and MOUNCE, *Revelation*, 214; cf. SWETE, *Apocalypse*, 130, who maintains that “the ναός here must be taken to include the ἱερόν”; contra, e.g., BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 268-269. While it is not clear which temple John had in mind, or whether he was rather thinking in terms of a generic temple, the reference to the “holy city” in 11,2 suggests that the primary background of the temple imagery in these two verses is nevertheless Jewish rather than Greco-Roman.

<sup>(15)</sup> So, e.g., BEALE, *Commentary*, 561.

<sup>(16)</sup> For Beale’s attempt to get around this difficulty, see his *Commentary*, 561.

<sup>(17)</sup> See AUNE, *Revelation*, 606, and the references therein. BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 269, has argued it refers to the altar of incense inside the sanctuary, but that would make the mentioning of the altar superfluous (unless we take the preceding καὶ as epexegetical or offer some other explanation).

It could also be argued that since the earlier references to the altar in Revelation (6,9; 8,3.5; 9,13) seem to refer to the altar of incense, the altar in 11,1 must also be an altar of incense. However, the earlier instances clearly describe something which is located in heaven before God’s throne, whereas 11,1-2 appears to portray something on earth, and all the earthly temples (including the temple in Ezekiel’s vision) had an altar of burnt offering.

spiritually protected but physically vulnerable, if that were John's intention.

There is an alternative way of reading Rev 11,1-2 which solves some of the problems outlined above while still adhering to the traditional "spiritual protection vs. physical vulnerability"-view. The καί between the sanctuary and the altar could be taken as epexegetical, thus equating the sanctuary with the altar and the worshipers<sup>(18)</sup>. This reading has at least three advantages: First, there is no longer uncertainty over the identification of the altar and the "outer court". The altar is the altar of incense, located within the sanctuary, and the court is the court immediately surrounding the sanctuary. Second, the mention of the worshipers, who must be priests in order to worship within the sanctuary, now makes more sense. Finally, the worshipers are no longer a direct object of measuring and thus the use of μετρέω ceases to be a lexical problem.

However, though the moving of the altar and the worshipers inside the sanctuary may solve some of the issues, the traditional interpretation remains problematic. For example, the mention of the altar still seems superfluous, and the use of the verb ἐκβάλλω with the "outer court" remains unexplained<sup>(19)</sup>. Moreover, according to both variants of the traditional interpretive schema, John is using not only the "sanctuary", the "worshipers" (possibly the "altar"), and the "outer court", but also the "holy city" to refer to the Church — *and all this within what is essentially a single sentence*<sup>(20)</sup>. While there is no a

<sup>(18)</sup> Two commentators come close to this view: BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 268-269, does not make this syntactical point, but nevertheless locates the altar and the worshipers within the sanctuary; and BEALE, *Commentary*, 571, hints at the possibility of taking the καί between the altar and the worshipers as epexegetical, thus identifying the worshipers with the sanctuary and the altar.

<sup>(19)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 270-272, suggests that John uses ἐκβάλλω to translate שָׁלַךְ in Dan 8,11 and that Dan 8,11-13 and Zech 12,13 explain the image of casting out the "outer court". His proposal as a whole is intriguing, though his case is weakened by at least three things: First, it is based on a reconstruction of a non-extant Hebrew *Vorlage* of Zech 12,13; second, it maintains that John understood that the sanctuary would be preserved, though both the LXX and Theodotion of Dan 8,11 seem to suggest the opposite; and third, it does not adequately explain the way John supposedly understood and translated Hebrew. For example, why translate שָׁלַךְ with ἐκβάλλω and not with any of the other verbs used by the translators of the LXX and Theodotion? and, why read מִכֶּן מִקְדָּשׁ as the court when it seems to refer to the sanctuary as similar expressions elsewhere (e.g., Ps 33,14; 97,2) suggest?

<sup>(20)</sup> So, e.g., BEALE, *Commentary*, 570. Alternative interpretations have been offered, e.g., by J.R. MICHAELS, *Revelation* (Downers Grove 1997) 142, and C.H.



*priori* reason why John could not have packed his images this tightly, it nevertheless seems that the traditional interpretation fails to do full justice to the text and that a reconsideration is warranted.

Finally, the traditional view can be criticized for its claim that measuring in itself symbolizes spiritual protection and, by implication, physical vulnerability. Support for this interpretation of measuring as signifying protection is derived primarily from the OT. However, while vulnerability and security are in some ways present in our passage, a more nuanced reading is demanded. The traditional view seems to fly in the face of both what follows (the two witnesses, usually also taken to symbolize the Church, are protected physically)<sup>(21)</sup>, and what is one of Revelation's themes, namely, the reality of spiritual danger and the consequences of apostasy<sup>(22)</sup>. Moreover, nowhere in the OT does measuring in itself symbolize protection, as we will see in the next section.

## II. Measuring in the Old Testament

A number of OT texts mention measuring, but only a handful of passages are normally proposed to support the claim that measuring in Rev 11,1-2 symbolizes protection and security. The relevant passages are 2 Sam 8,2, Isa 28,16-17, Isa 34,11, Jer 31,38-40, Mic 2,5, Zech 1,16, Zech 2,1-2, and Ezek 40-48<sup>(23)</sup>. In addition, 2 Kgs 21,13, Lam 2,8, and Amos 7,7-9, are often mentioned in the same context to show how the act of measuring can also signify judgment. Before commenting on these OT texts, however, we will briefly consider two

---

GIBLIN, "Revelation 11.1-13: Its Form, Function, and Contextual Integration", *NTS* 30 (1984) 438-440, who see *ναός* as the heavenly sanctuary, and identify "the holy city" with "the great city" in v. 8, which they understand to symbolize the world; and by A. McNICOL, "Revelation 11:1-14 and the Structure of the Apocalypse", *RestQ* 22 (1979) 199-202, for whom "the holy city" is the literal Jerusalem.

<sup>(21)</sup> So also AUNE, *Revelation*, 604.

<sup>(22)</sup> As Rev 3,4-5 shows, it is possible to "defile one's garments" and have one's name "blotted out of the book of life". For a thorough treatment of the theme of apostasy in Revelation, see W.L. WARREN, "Apostasy in the Book of Revelation" (Ph.D. diss.; The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1983).

<sup>(23)</sup> It is not clear why Ezek 29,6 LXX is sometimes mentioned (see, e.g., McNICOL, "Revelation", 198; and BEALE, *Commentary*, 559) in the context of measuring, as it has nothing to do with measuring, though it may well be that the mention of *βάβδος*, which also occurs in Rev 11,1-2, has somehow attracted this verse to the list.

other passages sometimes adduced, namely Hen(aeth) 61,1-5 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIV (VI), 25-27.

### 1. Examination of Key Passages

With respect to Hen(aeth) 61, it is easy to agree with Charles that “the exact meaning of measuring in this passage is difficult to determine”<sup>(24)</sup>. More uncertain, however, is his contention that the general sense of measuring is nevertheless clear, signifying “spiritual preservation... or restoration of those who had been *physically* destroyed, to the spiritual community of the Messianic Kingdom”<sup>(25)</sup>. Rather, the measuring of the “lots of the righteous” seems to refer to “the allocation of the promised land in paradise”, possibly as a reward for faithfulness, as Black suggests<sup>(26)</sup>. Furthermore, Black maintains that the reading according to which measuring or measures will “strengthen righteousness”<sup>(27)</sup> is a “most improbable original”<sup>(28)</sup>. Thus, while vv. 1-5 as a whole appear to refer to the final gathering and resurrection of the righteous to the presence of the Lord of spirits, it cannot be established that angels’ measuring actually signifies the protection of the righteous.

The passage from *Hodayot* is somewhat more relevant to our text. The author is praising God, whose righteous standards and way of building guarantee the inviolability of the city or fortress that symbolizes the community of the righteous. The phrases “tested stones”, “line of justice” and “level of truth” suggest that the prophecy of Isa 28,16-17 may well have influenced this passage<sup>(29)</sup>. Yet, neither

<sup>(24)</sup> CHARLES, *Revelation*, 276; cf. AUNE, *Revelation*, 604, who considers the passage “very difficult”.

<sup>(25)</sup> CHARLES, *Revelation*, 276.

<sup>(26)</sup> M. BLACK, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch*. A New English Edition (Leiden 1985), 231; cf. PRIGENT, *L’Apocalypse*, 263, n. 9: “Ces mesures de l’héritage éternel sont données pour récompenser la fidélité des justes”.

<sup>(27)</sup> So the translation of Hen(aeth) 61,5 by E. ISAAC in *OTP* I.

<sup>(28)</sup> BLACK, *Enoch*, 231; contra, e.g., CHARLES, *Revelation*, 276; M.A. KNIBB, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments (Oxford 1978) II, 148; and BEALE, *Commentary*, 564. The date of this original is, of course, much debated. Black himself proposes a Hebrew *Urschrift* for chapters 37–71, dating it to the “early Roman period, probably pre-70 A.D.” (*Enoch*, 188). Yet, in the absence of any manuscript or other external evidence this remains conjectural; the Parables of Enoch could even post-date Revelation (the date of which is still being disputed).

<sup>(29)</sup> So also S. HOLM-NIELSEN, *Hodayot*. Psalms from Qumran (Aarhus 1960) 119.

text appears to support the claim that measuring signifies protection. Certainly here any idea of measuring is at best implicit, and the notion of protection only derives from the fact that the builder of the building is God himself<sup>(30)</sup>.

“Stretching a [measuring] line” (נָסַח קֶוֶן in Hebrew; usually translated as ἐκτείνω μέτρον) belongs to the vocabulary of construction (Isa 44,13; Job 38,5; Zech 1,16; cf. Jer 31,38-40), but the expression can also be used metaphorically to signify destruction. In 2 Kgs 21,13, Yahweh promises to stretch over Jerusalem “the line of Samaria and the level of the house of Ahab”, and in Isa 34,11 over Edom “a line of desolation and stones of emptiness” (cf. Lam 2,8). The “line” and “level” can also signify Yahweh’s righteous standards, against which human works are measured (Isa 28,16-17; Amos 7,7-9)<sup>(31)</sup>. The kind of practice referred to in Mic 2,5 is less certain, but the “casting of the rope by lot” seems to describe the allotment of the land among God’s people.

The remaining three texts normally cited in support of the traditional view actually use a verb which can be translated “to measure” or “to measure off” (Hebrew מָדַד, Greek διαμετρέω). In 2 Sam 8,2, the defeated Moabites are separated into two groups: those who are put to death, and those who are kept alive. Both the LXX and the MT suggest that the separation was somehow carried out with “ropes” or “the rope”, respectively, a procedure perhaps akin to what is described in Mic 2,5<sup>(32)</sup>. While it may be argued that “measuring off” or “dividing up” especially in this context connotes separation, it does not in itself imply protection or destruction any more than does, say, the use of the verb “to lie down” or the noun “rope” in this same verse. Moreover, in the absence of clear verbal or thematic links with Rev 11,1-2 it seems very unlikely that John’s audience, in their search for meaning, would have recalled 2 Sam 8,2 and, on the basis of that verse, concluded that the act of measuring must connote security or protection<sup>(33)</sup>.

<sup>(30)</sup> Moreover, if John’s intention was to communicate effectively to the predominantly Gentile churches of Asia Minor towards the end of the first century AD, he probably would not have assumed his audience to be well-versed in the writings of the Qumran community.

<sup>(31)</sup> On Amos 7,7-9, see M.A. SWEENEY, *The Twelve Prophets* (Collegeville, MA 2000) II, 584.

<sup>(32)</sup> So, e.g., R.P. GORDON, *1 and 2 Samuel. A Commentary* (Exeter 1986) 243.

<sup>(33)</sup> Contra, e.g., CHARLES, *Revelation*, 275, who holds that the only possible meaning of μετρέω in its original, pre-Revelation context is “physical

A somewhat better candidate for an OT background can be found in Zech 2,1-2. In a vision, Zechariah sees a man with a “rope of measuring” (חבל מדה) in his hand, on his way to measure Jerusalem. The purpose of the measuring here is not to protect the city but to find out “how wide and how long it is”, as the man explains to Zechariah. Measuring precedes building and is therefore a necessary step in preparation for the rebuilding of the city and its walls<sup>(34)</sup>. This also fits the larger context of Zechariah’s visions which concern the restoration of Jerusalem and its temple. But if measuring connotes rebuilding, the sense of protection in this chapter as a whole derives from Yahweh’s explicit promise that he will come and dwell in Jerusalem amongst his people, and be “a wall of fire around her” (v. 5).

The third possibility for an OT background of the measuring of the sanctuary is Ezek 40–48<sup>(35)</sup>. Here the prophet is taken in a vision to a very high mountain near a city, where he sees a man with a “line of measuring” (קנה המדה, κάλαμος μέτρου) in his hand. Ezekiel is told to observe everything carefully as the man measures the various structures of the temple compound (including ναός in ch. 41), and explains what the future temple will be like, what the dimensions of its various parts are, how it will function, and how the land is to be divided between the tribes. Ezekiel is then to describe the temple and its plan to the people of Israel (40,4; 43,10). If they are ashamed of their sins, he is to make known to them the design of the temple and all its regulations and laws so that they may be faithful to its design and follow all its regulations (43,11). Thus the purpose of measuring is not to signify security or protection but to reveal to Ezekiel Yahweh’s plan regarding the return of the Glory, the restoration of pure worship, and

---

preservation”, derived from 2 Sam 8,2b. Yet, he maintains that in its present context (i.e., Rev 11,1-2), it signifies preservation from spiritual rather than physical danger.

<sup>(34)</sup> As SWEENEY, *Prophets*, 584, points out, חבל מדה “is simply a device employed to measure the boundaries of land that are to be assigned as the inheritance or the property of a tribe or an individual (cf. Mic 2:4-5; Amos 7:7; Deut 32:9; 1 Chr 16:18=Ps 105:11; Josh 17:5, 14; 19:9; Ezek 47:13; Deut 3:4, 13, 14; 1 Kgs 4:13)”.

<sup>(35)</sup> Ezek 40–42(48) and Zech 2 are normally invoked as the two primary candidates for the OT background of the act of measuring, the former usually receiving greater emphasis; see AUNE, *Revelation*, 604; CAIRD, *Revelation*, 130; FARRER, *Images*, 130-131; HENDRIKSEN, *Conquerors*, 126; MURPHY, *Fallen*, 258; PRIGENT, *L’Apocalypse*, 341; RESSEGUIE, *Revelation*, 92, 183; and SWEET, *Revelation*, 182.

the reordering of the tribes. The inviolability of the sanctuary is *not* due to the measuring of the temple compound but is conveyed by the exceptionally thick walls and gates and by the fact that Yahweh himself has promised to make it his eternal dwelling.

While it may perhaps be argued that Ezek 40–48 resembles the act of measuring in Rev 11 more than the other candidates, it does not automatically follow that the former is the background of the latter. For example, the measuring in Rev 21 is clearly based on Ezekiel's temple prophecy, but it is also very different from the measuring in ch. 11. That is, Ezek 40–48 and Rev 21,10–22,1 have several elements in common<sup>(36)</sup>, whereas there are only two similarities between Rev 11 and the other two measuring accounts, and even these similarities are fairly general: First, a rod or reed of some kind is used for measuring, but while Ezekiel and Rev 21 use *κάλαμος μέτρον*, ch. 11 has *κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδῳ*<sup>(37)</sup>; and second, the object of measuring, whether the New Jerusalem, or its temple or a part thereof, is the eschatological dwelling place that God will build, or is building, for himself. On the other hand, in Rev 11 it is John who is doing the measuring, not an angel<sup>(38)</sup>; the measuring is not narrated; and the object of measuring seems to be the sanctuary as a whole rather than the various architectural structures and their dimensions. Therefore, even if one grants that Rev 11 may be influenced by Ezekiel's account, the lack of affinities suggests that the measuring cannot be adequately explained on the basis of Ezek 40–48 alone.

## 2. *An Alternative Understanding of Measuring*

Though the background texts normally cited in support of the traditional view are not able to deliver as advertized, there is a role that Ezek 40–48 can play, together with Zech 2 and Rev 21<sup>(39)</sup>, in our

<sup>(36)</sup> See D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel*. Chapters 25–48 (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 502–503, for a list of eight elements the passages have in common.

<sup>(37)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 269, n. 46, argues that John is most likely dependent on Zech 2 for the image of measuring and has therefore carefully distinguished his measuring from the measurements in Rev 21 and Ezek 40–48 by giving himself a different kind of measuring rod.

<sup>(38)</sup> Both Zechariah 2 and Ezekiel actually have *וְאֵשׁ*, taken usually by commentators to refer to an angel.

<sup>(39)</sup> That there is a close relationship between these three passages was already observed by SWETE, *Apocalypse*, 129.

attempt to determine the significance of the measuring in Rev 11. Two observations can be made: First, the act of measuring in all three passages seems to be a prophetic device whereby God provides the prophet with information about his plans for his people, in order to encourage the prophet (cf. Ezek 40,4)<sup>(40)</sup>. Or to put it in a different way: the act of measuring is a narrative device used by the author to communicate something to the audience. Second, we should underscore the major difference between Rev 11 and the other three passages: John is told *not* to measure something, and even explained why this is so. Granting that there is such a thing as a measuring motif, then this deviation from the normal pattern is a signal to the audience to pay special attention to the excluded item(s). We will return to this point later.

We may now summarize the relevance of the proposed OT background passages to the act of measuring in Rev 11. First, measuring in itself symbolizes neither destruction nor protection in any of the passages, though some of the vocabulary related to construction and building can with certain modifications be used metaphorically to connote judgment or destruction (2 Kgs 21,13; Isa 34,11; cf. Lam 2,8). Second, while the nearest background text to Rev 11,1-2 may well be Ezek 40–48, its clear parallel in Rev 21 suggests that it is not John's intention to evoke (only) Ezekiel's temple vision here. Third, the act of measuring seems rather to be a prophetic-literary device whereby God directs the prophet's attention to some aspects of his plan concerning the object measured, in order that the prophet may learn something, and then proclaim it<sup>(41)</sup>. Finally, any sense of protection or security in the measuring passages of Ezekiel, Zechariah

<sup>(40)</sup> The fact that the actual measuring is not narrated in Zech 2,1-5 and Rev 11,1-2 also suggests that the emphasis in these passages may lie elsewhere, i.e., the mention of measuring is merely a means to an end.

<sup>(41)</sup> Ezek 40,4; cf. 43,10: "As for you, son of man, describe the temple to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities". PRIGENT, *L'Apocalypse*, 263, n. 9, comes close to this view: "l'image des mesures [inHen(aeth) 61,1-5] renvoie donc à un plan de Dieu pour les élus"; and, "mesurer... c'est préserver. Ou plutôt manifester l'intention divine de montrer dès maintenant le caractère assuré de son plan de salut" (ibid., italics mine); cf. AUNE, *Revelation*, 604, who sees the act of measuring in Ezek 40–42 as a "device for providing a detailed description of the future temple"; and A. SPATAFORA, *From the Temple of God to God as the Temple*. A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation (Rome 1997) 164, who considers the act of measuring in Rev 11 as "a symbolic gesture that announces God's plan regarding the temple".

and Revelation 21 is primarily due to the fact that the entity measured is/will be the eternal dwelling-place of God<sup>(42)</sup>.

### 3. *The Problem with the Traditional View*

Before moving on to the next section, let us take a final look at the quest for OT texts in support of the traditional reading of Rev 11. The problem many commentators have with regard to the interpretation of the act of measuring is perhaps best illustrated by quoting Briggs, who maintains that “[m]easuring in the Bible usually means (1) rebuilding or restoration; (2) destruction; (3) preservation from physical or spiritual harm; or (4) purification”<sup>(43)</sup>. This statement shows confusion between the verb “to measure” and the various contexts where it is being used. For example, the verb מִדַּד occurs 52 times in the MT, and while its precise meaning in 2 Sam 8,2 may be debated and while in Ezek 43,10 it seems to have the sense “to study”, the remaining 49 times it means finding the size, length, or amount of something; or has the sense “to measure out/off”<sup>(44)</sup>. The same applies to διαμετρέω and μετρέω, which occur a total of 42 times in the LXX and Theodotion. Commentators may be right in sensing that protection is somehow present in Rev 11,1-2, but it appears that the search for earlier OT (or extra-biblical) passages where “[m]easuring... means... preservation from physical or spiritual harm” is not only misguided, but also unnecessary, as we shall see.

## III. A proposal for a new view

### 1. *Towards a Solution of the Lexical Problems*

Let us look at Rev 11,1-2 again. The imperative “measure” is followed by four objects connected by three καίς, followed by another imperative, “cast out”. Both verbs are complemented by one or more of the four objects sandwiched between them. The commands ἐκβάλε and μὴ αὐτὴν μετρήσῃς indicate that one of the three καίς has

<sup>(42)</sup> Cf. BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 269, n. 46, who correctly observes that “the measuring [in Zech 2,1-2] does not strictly signify protection” even though “the idea of protection is prominent in the passage”.

<sup>(43)</sup> BRIGGS, *Imagery*, 27, n. 82; see also AUNE, *Revelation*, 604; and FORD, *Revelation*, 176.

<sup>(44)</sup> Not counting מִדַּד, a possible secondary form of מִדַּד in Hab 3,6, where it would have a meaning similar to מִדַּד in Ezek 43,10; cf. *BDB*, 551b.

adversative force<sup>(45)</sup>, but the question is, which one? The traditional view assigns this function to καί<sub>3</sub>, but that is not the only possibility. Instead of taking καί<sub>1</sub> and καί<sub>2</sub> as copulative, and καί<sub>3</sub> as adversative, we can interpret καί<sub>1</sub> as adversative, καί<sub>2</sub> as copulative, and καί<sub>3</sub> as epexegetical<sup>(46)</sup>. The text would then read as follows<sup>(47)</sup>:

ἔγειρε	Get up
καὶ	and
μέτρησον τὸν ναὸν	measure the sanctuary
τοῦ θεοῦ	of God
καὶ <sub>1</sub>	but
τὸ θυσιαστήριον	the altar
καὶ <sub>2</sub>	and
τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας	those worshipping
ἐν αὐτῷ	near it,
καὶ <sub>3</sub>	that is,
τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἔξωθεν	the court outside
τοῦ ναοῦ	of the temple,
ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν	cast out outside
καὶ	and
[ μετρήσης ] μὴ αὐτήν	do not measure it

This arrangement yields several interesting results. First, it does not violate the Greek syntax — if we can indeed use such an argument in Revelation. Second, it preserves the symmetry of the four commands. Third, it better connects the accusatives with verbs that more naturally go with them. That is, only the sanctuary and the “outer court” function as objects of the verb “to measure”; there is no need to “count” the worshipers. While the phrase “cast outside” remains grammatically connected to the “outer court”, at least it now includes a reference to the “worshipers”. Fourth, taking ἐν αὐτῷ to refer to its nearest grammatically possible antecedent τὸ θυσιαστήριον, and taking καί<sub>3</sub> as epexegetical, present no problems. Alternatively, ἐν

<sup>(45)</sup> On adversative/contrastive conjunctions, see, e.g., D.B. WALLACE, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics. An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids 1996) 671.

<sup>(46)</sup> Taking καί<sub>1</sub> as epexegetical and καί<sub>3</sub> as adversative would perhaps in some ways result in a more “natural” reading of Greek, but the context (e.g., the lexical difficulties pointed out in Section I of this paper) would signal the audience that an alternative configuration is required.

<sup>(47)</sup> The Greek text follows NA<sup>27</sup> but omits any punctuation. There are no significant textual variations in 11,1-2.



αὐτῷ could be rendered “in it”, for as Aune has noted, θυσιαστήριον (which literally means “the place of sacrifice”) can also refer to the altar area<sup>(48)</sup>.

This reading not only addresses various lexical issues, but also resolves some interpretive questions. For example, τὸ θυσιαστήριον can now take its rightful place as the altar of burnt offering, located in the court outside the sanctuary. Similarly, the “court outside the sanctuary” is the court immediately surrounding the sanctuary, regardless of how many other courts there might have been in the temple that served as a model, if indeed John had a specific temple in mind<sup>(49)</sup>. But at least three significant questions remain: why does John mention the altar and the worshipers at all? why are the worshipers to be cast out? and, how does the act of measuring function in this context? These questions are interrelated, but let us begin by tackling the first two.

## 2. Towards a Solution of the Interpretive Problems

As already noted, John must have had a reason to include a reference to the altar and to the worshipers. Within the traditional view, the emphasis is on explaining who the worshipers are and to which altar τὸ θυσιαστήριον refers, but the view usually ignores the question of why they are mentioned in the first place. If the issue is addressed, the inclusion of the worshipers and the altar is thought, as Murphy puts it, to “constitute a cultic scene which in its entirety represents the church in union with its God through worship”<sup>(50)</sup>. However, it is a contention of this essay that the reference serves another purpose: John has mentioned not only the sanctuary and the “outer court”, but also the altar and the worshipers, in order to allude to the visit of another prophet to the temple in a vision, namely, to Ezek 8–9<sup>(51)</sup>. There

<sup>(48)</sup> AUNE, *Revelation*, 606, 405.

<sup>(49)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 268-269 also takes the courtyard to be the innermost court regardless of the temple John might have had in mind. He differs from our proposal, however, by locating the altar and the worshipers inside the ναός, and by following the general “spiritual protection vs. physical vulnerability”-interpretation.

<sup>(50)</sup> MURPHY, *Fallen*, 261; cf. BEALE, *Commentary*, 563, who sees the altar as representing “the sacrificial calling” of the Church.

<sup>(51)</sup> The mention of all four items provides enough markers for a competent reader/listener of Revelation to make the connection, especially as s/he has already accessed the context of Ezek 8–9 while attempting to process the image

Ezekiel is transported by the Spirit to the “house of Yahweh” in Jerusalem, and shown the idolatry that is rampant there. The prophet is taken around the temple compound and finally brought to the courtyard outside the sanctuary. There, between the altar and the entrance to the sanctuary, twenty-five men are worshiping the sun, their backs towards the sanctuary where Yahweh’s Glory dwells:

καὶ εἰσήγαγέν με εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν οἴκου κυρίου τὴν ἑσωτέραν καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν προθύρων τοῦ ναοῦ κυρίου ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν αἰλαμ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ὡς εἴκοσι ἄνδρες τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀπέναντι καὶ οὗτοι προσκυνοῦσιν τῷ ἡλίῳ (Ezek 8:16 LXX) <sup>(52)</sup>

This is the height of abomination. The only thing that can follow is the judgment of Yahweh. Next Ezekiel sees seven angels who are told to kill the entire population of Jerusalem, save the small remnant “who grieve and lament over all the detestable things” that are done in the house of Yahweh (9,4). The faithful ones among God’s people receive a mark on their foreheads so that they will not be judged with the rest. Then the angels are told to begin slaughtering at the sanctuary (v. 6) and to desecrate it (v. 7). They do as commanded, and finally Ezekiel is shown how the Glory of Yahweh departs from his house that had been defiled by the idolaters among his people.

Against this background we can better grasp what John is trying to communicate. If the sanctuary represents the faithful church, as the majority of the proponents of the figurative view believe, then it would appear that the worshipers and the altar in the court outside the sanctuary symbolize corrupt cult and idolatrous/syncretistic Christians. Possibilities here might include “Jezebel”, those following

---

of the sealing of the 144,000 in ch. 7, agreed by virtually all commentators to be modeled after the sealing of the faithful remnant in Ezek 9,4; see, e.g., the account of the act of interpreting an allusion by Z. BEN-PORAT, “The Poetics of Literary Allusion”, *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976) 105-128; cf. the Relevance-Theoretic approach of S.W. PATTEMORE, “The People of God in the Apocalypse: A Relevance-Theoretic Study” (Ph.D. diss.; University of Otago 2000) 2-86, and *passim*.

<sup>(52)</sup> S. MOYISE (see the summary statement in his *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* [JSNTSS 115; Sheffield 1995] 17, n. 25) has argued that John makes use of both Greek and Hebrew texts of the OT. If he is translating from Hebrew, 8:16 LXX is a fair translation, at least of the MT. Had the LXX translated the Divine Name as “God” like John does, the verbal parallelism (the text in bold) with Rev 11,1b-2a would be even more remarkable.

the teaching of “Balaam”, the Nicolaitans, and other opponents of John in the churches<sup>(53)</sup>. As Bauckham has pointed out, “the principal danger” for John’s audience was not persecution but “compromise with and assimilation to pagan society”<sup>(54)</sup>. Ultimately, the idolaters will be separated from and cast out of the company of the righteous, unless they repent (Rev 2,14-16.20-22)<sup>(55)</sup>. This would also fit well the only uses of the phrase “cast outside” in the LXX mentioned earlier. The first passage, Lev 14,34-40, gives instructions regarding a house possibly infected with growth that makes it ritually unclean. The house is given seven days, and if the contamination spreads, the unclean stones must be removed and thrown out of the city. The second passage, 2 Chr 29,16, describes the cleansing and consecration of the temple, and how the priests cast out to the courtyard every unclean thing that was found in the sanctuary.

The proposed new reading also gains support by the inclusion of

<sup>(53)</sup> So, e.g., M. KIDDLE, *The Revelation of St. John* (London 1947) 189; and R.J. MCKELVEY, *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford 1969) 159; cf. PATTEMORE, “People”, 278, who observes that the description of the ministry of the two witnesses later in ch. 11 includes several motifs from the ministries of Moses and Elijah, who opposed Balaam (Num 23–25) and Jezebel (1 Kgs 18–19, 21). He also argues (*ibid.*, 278, 284, and *passim*) that in ch. 11 and elsewhere John alludes to heretical and compromising Christians and his opponents within the churches and consistently keeps “sharpening the demarcation lines” (*ibid.*, 278).

BEALE, *Commentary*, 560, considers the identification of that which is “cast out” with heretical or compromising believers “unlikely” because there is no mention of such a group in what follows in ch. 11. However, this is a *non sequitur*.

<sup>(54)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 234. Cf. WARREN, “Apostasy”, 209, who concludes that for John, “[i]nherent in apostasy is a failure to perceive the true nature of the Church’s enemies and, hence, of the adversaries of Christ — whether those opponents be ... tendencies toward syncretism ... the adoption of a culture’s immorality ... or the false prophet’s call to worship the glorious and powerful emperor”; K.A. STRAND, “‘Overcomer’. A Study in the Macrodynamics of Theme Development in the Book of Revelation”, *AUSS* 28 (1990) 237-254 (250); and BORING, *Revelation*, 92-93.

<sup>(55)</sup> Both in Ezekiel (43,12; 44,9) and Revelation (21,27; 22,15) we see how nothing impure was allowed to enter the dwelling place of God. FARRER, *Images*, 128, FORD, *Revelation*, 176-177 and HENDRIKSEN, *Conquerors*, 127, similarly see in 11,1-2 a division between the faithful (νόμος) and the unfaithful. However, since they include the altar and the worshipers in the act of measuring, the emphasis of their interpretation is on the idea that the world invades and takes possession of the unfaithful part of the Church, rather than on the resulting judgment by God, as our reading suggests.

the motif of the trampling of the holy city by the nations<sup>(56)</sup>. In the OT it is always Yahweh who brings the nations against the “holy city”<sup>(57)</sup>, as a consequence of his people’s idolatry. The purpose of the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC was to judge Judah, but at least some OT prophetic texts suggest that one purpose of the final eschatological trampling of the holy city will be redemptive, to purify the people and bring about repentance among them (so, for example, Zech 12–14; Dan 11–12)<sup>(58)</sup>. It is also worth noting that if our reading of John is correct, he is by no means alone in the NT in warning some in his audience about the impending judgment. For example, the author of 1 Peter, which has a number of conceptual parallels with Revelation, exhorts his audience by alluding to Ezek 9,6 LXX<sup>(59)</sup>:

<sup>(56)</sup> E.g., Isa 63,18; Dan 8,13; 1 Macc 3,45.51; 4,60; 3 Macc 2,18; ApcBar(gr) 67,2. L.A. Vos, *The Synoptic Traditions in the Apocalypse* (Kampen 1965) 122, argues that John “clearly alludes” to the prediction of Jesus found in Luke 21,24, but as BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 271, n. 48, has pointed out, Vos fails to recognize that both passages are dependent on Dan 8,13.

<sup>(57)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 272, n. 50, objects to the distinguishing the faithful from an apostate part of the people of God on the basis of the use of the term “holy city” to refer to the New Jerusalem elsewhere in Revelation. However, it can also be argued that those other references are qualified and explicit, while this one is not; cf., e.g., Isa 48, where Israel calls itself “holy city”, but worships idols.

<sup>(58)</sup> See also Mal 3,1-6 and TestXII.Ben 10,8-9. I.T. BECKWITH, *The Apocalypse of John*. Studies in Introduction with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary (New York 1919; repr. Grand Rapids 1967), who takes vv. 1-2 as relating to the ethnic Israel, nevertheless sees similar OT motifs here: the faithful remnant, symbolized by the sanctuary (and the worshipers), is preserved, and the trampling is a form of divine chastisement, whose purpose is to bring about repentance.

The length of trampling, “42 months”, and its parallels (“1260 days” and “time, and time, and half a time”) are all well-known apocalyptic symbols for a time of national distress or the limited period of final eschatological tribulation (see, e.g., AUNE, *Revelation*, 609-610). Interestingly, BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 227-228, notes how this period (cf. Dan 11,35; 12,10) was understood in 1QM and in the medieval Hebrew *Signs of the Messiah* as purifying Israel and purging her of her wicked members. He himself, however, sees the purification as a (voluntary?) act of martyrdom.

<sup>(59)</sup> For an allusion to Ezek 9,6b LXX in 1 Peter 4,17, see, e.g., J.R. MICHAELS, *1 Peter* (WBC 49; Dallas 1988) 271; and P.H. DAVIDS, *The First Epistle of Peter* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1990) 171; contra J.H. ELLIOTT, *1 Peter*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 37b; Garden City, NY 2000) 798-799, whose case against the majority view is somewhat weakened by his reading the LXX against the MT.

The other conceptual parallels between 1 Peter and Revelation include the following: (1) The recipients of 1 Peter are undergoing “various trials” and possibly persecution; (2) their faith is being tested by these trials; (3) they are a “spiritual

“For it is time for judgment to begin with the family of God” (1 Pet 4,17a NIV).

### 3. *The Measuring of the Sanctuary*

We can now pull the various threads of this investigation together by considering the function(s) of measuring in our passage. As has been pointed out, the commands to measure and not to measure create a contrast between the measured and non-measured item(s)<sup>(60)</sup>. Measuring is thus a device that draws a line of demarcation between the two groups or entities. If John is consciously using OT motifs, he deviates from them in at least two ways. First, the fact that John is told *not* to measure something is a signal to the audience to pay attention especially to the excluded items<sup>(61)</sup>. The narrative of Ezekiel’s visionary visit to the temple in Ezek 8–9 explains the mention of all four measured and non-measured items, and hints at the ultimate doom of idolaters among the people of God. Second, while nothing is said about the fate of the thing measured (i.e., the sanctuary), the contrast with that which is not measured (i.e., the court outside the sanctuary and everything therein) suggests that it will not be cast out (and, implicitly, not be exposed to the trampling by the nations). Thus the prophetic act of measuring the sanctuary is not intended to convey that Christians are spiritually protected during the final tribulation (thus rendering meaningless all the warnings to the contrary in Revelation), while physically vulnerable (which was, after all, part and parcel of being a Christian). Rather, John is being more subversive. Traditionally, the whole temple compound is trampled (Dan 8,13), but John takes a different tack. Unlike the sanctuaries of the past, this one will be protected from God’s judgment<sup>(62)</sup>. Idolatry among God’s people will still be judged, but this

---

house”, and a “royal priesthood”; (4) they are to declare the praises/power of God; (5) they are to demonstrate the life of Jesus among the nations so that as they observe them, they may give glory to God in the day of visitation; and (6) they are to follow Christ’s example, who suffered for them and in whose mouth no deceit was found. The items 2, 3, 5, and 6 are closely related to Rev 11,1-13.

<sup>(60)</sup> So, e.g., G. STEVENSON, *Power and Place*. Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation (Berlin – New York 2001) 259.

<sup>(61)</sup> This is further enforced by a degree of ambiguity in the text. Ambiguity in prophetic literature is often used to grab the attention of the audience and direct it to the real issue at stake.

<sup>(62)</sup> According to the majority view, the measuring of the sanctuary parallels the sealing of the 144,000. While this paper has argued for a more nuanced understanding of Rev 11,1-2, it also suggests that the links between the two

time God's Glory will not abandon its earthly sanctuary. The sense of preservation with regard to the sanctuary is created by the contrast with the non-measured items and their fate; there is no need to search for OT passages where measuring symbolizes protection.

#### 4. *John's Mission?*

Before concluding, perhaps we may resuscitate an idea that was first put forward over half a century ago by Farrer. He noticed that John was not only given a scroll to eat, but also a "pen like a rod" to measure with, and proposed that "[t]he digesting of the scroll is a metaphorical reading, the measuring of the temple will be a metaphorical writing. St John the inspired prophet by his written prophecy is to effect what the 'measuring' describes" <sup>(63)</sup>. Could it be that just as the mission of the Church to the world is symbolically presented in vv. 3-13, so is the mission of John to the Church portrayed in vv. 1-2? After all, John is a servant of Christ, who wields the "rod of iron" that can be used to shepherd or break the nations, depending on their response to him (see Ps 2,9; cf. Rev 2,27; 12,5; 19,15). John's rod-like pen thus places the ultimate challenge before the audience: the lines are being drawn, and it is time for them to decide whether they stand with John or his opponents and ultimately, whether they will dwell in the New Jerusalem or come under God's judgment and be cast out.

Tyndale House  
36 Selwyn Gardens  
Cambridge CB3 9BA (UK)

Marko JAUHAINEN

#### SUMMARY

The act of measuring in Rev 11,1-2 does not portray the Church as spiritually protected but physically vulnerable, as normally thought. Not only are there lexical and interpretive difficulties with the traditional view, it is also not supported by the OT and extra-biblical evidence commonly adduced. Reading two *κοίς* differently and recognizing an allusion to Ezek 8:16 LXX addresses both the lexical and interpretive issues. The act of measuring is used to communicate the fact that contrary to Ezek 8-9, this time God will not abandon his earthly sanctuary, though idolatry among his people will still be judged.

---

passages are stronger than previously seen. I hope to argue elsewhere that just as with the act of measuring, what is at stake with the sealing is not spiritual protection from satanic attacks but rather protection of the faithful from God's judgment.

<sup>(63)</sup> FARRER, *Images*, 44.

## **Dt 32,8, une correction tardive des scribes** **Essai d'interprétation et de datation**

En 1962, Dominique Barthélemy eut le mérite de mettre en évidence une correction des scribes (un *tiqqûn sopherim*) non transmise par la tradition rabbinique. Il s'agit de la leçon «fils d'Israël» que nous avons en Dt 32,8. Avec l'appui des découvertes des mss de la Mer Morte, Barthélemy a démontré que la leçon ancienne était «fils de Dieu» comme certains le soupçonnaient déjà<sup>(1)</sup>. Sa contribution fut publiée en 1963 dans le volume 9 des Suppléments au Vetus Testamentum<sup>(2)</sup>. L'identification de cette correction des scribes n'a pas suscité d'objections et elle fait maintenant partie des *tiqqûné sopherim* identifiés<sup>(3)</sup>. D'ailleurs, actuellement certains n'hésitent pas à revenir à l'ancienne lecture, lorsqu'ils traitent de ce verset<sup>(4)</sup>.

Pour situer cette correction dans l'histoire, Barthélemy fait un parallélisme avec les 70 dieux, fils d'Ashérah, dans le panthéon d'Ugarit, qui ont chacun un pays en héritage. Il signale que ce chiffre motive l'énumération des descendants de Sem, Cham et Japhet en Gn 10. Or laisser l'expression «fils de Dieu» en Dt 32,8 risquerait, soit d'identifier YHWH à un des fils de Dieu, soit d'excuser le polythéisme parmi les nations. Barthélemy dit qu'on changea «bené Elohim» en «bené Israël» afin de «trouver une autre base pour justifier le chiffre connu des 70 peuples en lesquels Dieu divisa l'humanité après le déluge»<sup>(5)</sup>. Barthélemy signale le rapprochement que la tradition juive fait entre les 70 peuples et les 70 âmes des fils d'Israël qui sont

<sup>(1)</sup> Voir P. SANDERS, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (Leiden – New York – Köln 1996) 156 et la bibliographie de la note 281.

<sup>(2)</sup> D. BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquuné Sopherim et la critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament», *Congress Volume Bonn 1962* (ed. J. A. EMERTON) (VTS 9; Leiden 1963) 285-304 (= D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* [OBO 21; Fribourg/Suisse – Göttingen 1978] 91-110).

<sup>(3)</sup> C. MCCARTHY, *The Tiquune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Fribourg/Suisse – Göttingen 1981) 211-214.

<sup>(4)</sup> Voir par exemple H. RINGGREN, *La religion d'Israël* (Paris 1966) 107; T. RÖMER, *Dieu obscur. Le sexe, la cruauté et la violence dans l'Ancien Testament* (Essai bibliques 27; Genève 1996) 14; A. SCHENKER, «Le monothéisme israélite: un dieu qui transcende le monde et les dieux», *Bib* 78 (1997) 436-448. Voir spécialement 438.

<sup>(5)</sup> BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquuné Sopherim», 297.

descendus en Egypte. Or, dans le TM et dans la LXX, Dt 10,22 parle de 70 âmes des pères qui sont descendus en Egypte, alors qu'il existe des leçons anciennes en Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 qui ont le total de 75<sup>(6)</sup>.

Barthélemy dit que les deux corrections, celle qui réduisit à 70 les 75 descendants de Jacob en Egypte en Gn 46,27 et en Ex 1,5 ainsi que celle qui transforma en fils d'Israël les fils de Dieu de Dt 32,8 sont intimement liées<sup>(7)</sup>. Dans une autre publication, Dt 32,8 est considéré comme ayant été changé très tôt, parce qu'il est à l'origine du changement dans ces passages de Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 ainsi que quelques autres<sup>(8)</sup>.

Le fait que Jub 44,33-34 fasse une tentative de justifier le nouveau chiffre de 70, fait penser à Barthélemy que cette correction date des débuts de la dynastie hasmonéenne. Il place à la même époque le doublet secondaire du *Tg. Ps.-J.* Il estime enfin que «l'hégémonie pharisienne qui commença vers 75 avant J.-C. mit un terme aux corrections théologiques du texte hébraïque de la Bible».

La question qui motive cet article est de savoir si on doit absolument considérer les deux corrections, sur le nombre des fils d'Israël et sur les fils de Dieu devenant les fils d'Israël, comme intimement liées. N'y a-t-il pas une autre possibilité de comprendre ces corrections en les étudiant séparément? Par exemple, ne peut-on pas montrer que le changement, si changement il y a eu, de 75 en 70 en Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 ne dépendait pas ou n'avait pas besoin d'être lié à la correction ou non de Dt 32,8? Si la réponse à cette question était positive, on pourrait interpréter la correction de Dt 32,8 autrement et probablement dater les deux corrections à deux époques différentes. C'est ce que nous nous proposons de faire dans ces quelques lignes. Nous nous basons principalement sur l'évolution théologique et la compréhension historique de l'expression «fils de Dieu».

(6) Pour ces deux passages, le texte massorétique lit 70. C'est le texte de la LXX et de Qumrân qui contiennent l'ancienne lecture de 75. Voir BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquné Sopherim», 297-301.

(7) BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquné Sopherim», 302.

(8) D. BARTHÉLEMY – A.R. HULST – N. LOHFINK – W.D. MCHARDY – H.P. RÜGER – J.A. SANDERS, *Compte rendu préliminaire et provisoire sur le travail d'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu* (London 1973, 1976) I, 302-303. La remarque de la p. 303 dit: «Ce cas a causé les altérations du TM en Gn 46.20,21,22,27; Ex 1.5». A la p. 70 où il est question de l'omission en Gn 46,20, le texte dit: «Cette omission dans le TM est due à des motifs théologiques, liés à Dt 32.8 où le texte fut très tôt changé. Ce changement entraîna des changements subsidiaires en Gn 46.20,21,27 et Ex 1.5». Nous avons des remarques similaires au sujet de ces versets cités. Voir pp. 71, 72 et 88.



Pour lier et dater les deux corrections à l'époque hasmonéenne, Barthélemy se base sur un problème théologique possible, celui d'identifier YHWH à un fils de Dieu ou excuser le polythéisme parmi les nations. A ce problème, il ajoute les témoignages de Jub et du *Tg. Ps.-J.*

Or, pour la première question, Adrian Schenker a démontré que sans devoir changer la forme ancienne du texte de Dt 32,8, l'on pouvait tout à fait identifier YHWH au Très haut. On pouvait également comprendre YHWH comme celui qui soumet les autres dieux <sup>(9)</sup>. La question du polythéisme parmi les nations a été réglée assez tôt, lorsqu'on interpréta les fils de Dieu comme ses anges.

En ce qui concerne le témoignage du livre des *Jubilés*, ce livre justifie le chiffre 70 mais il interprète encore les fils de Dieu de Gn 6,2 comme des anges. Comme on le verra, le *Tg. Ps.-J.* mélange les interprétations anciennes et tardives. Le fait que la glose de ce Targum en Dt 33,11 soit ancienne, ne dit pas nécessairement que les gloses du chapitre précédent le soient également.

Il nous semble donc que les bases d'argumentation de Barthélemy peuvent être ébranlées, ce qui explique notre démarche de chercher d'autres bases.

## I. Déconnecter Dt 32,8 de l'harmonisation des données sur le nombre des fils d'Israël

### 1. Importance de Dt 10,22 comme base de l'harmonisation

Dt 10,22 précise que les pères <sup>(10)</sup> qui sont descendus en Egypte étaient 70. Ce chiffre est confirmé par les sources hébraïques et

<sup>(9)</sup> SCHENKER, «Le monothéisme israélite», 438-441; A. SCHENKER, «Gott als Stifter der Religionen der Welt. Unerwartete Früchte textgeschichtliche Forschung», *La double transmission du texte biblique. Etudes d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (éd. Y. GOLDMAN – C. UEHLINGER) (OBO 179; Fribourg Suisse – Göttingen 2001) 99-102.

<sup>(10)</sup> La conception des «pères» en Dt ferait allusion à l'histoire qui débute en Egypte. T. RÖMER, «Le Deutéronome à la quête des origines», *Le Pentateuque, débats et recherches* (éd. P. HAUDEBERT) (XIV<sup>e</sup> congrès de l'ACFEB, Angers [1991]; LD 151; Paris 1992) 65-98. Voir spécialement 76-90. Pour la discussion à ce sujet, voir T. RÖMER, *Israels Väter. Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1990). Pour l'étude de Dt 10,22, voir 31-34; N. LOHFINK, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium. Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer* (OBO 111; Freiburg/Schweiz – Göttingen 1991).

grecques. Nous avons ici une tradition ancienne qui limite à 70 le nombre de ceux qui sont descendus en Egypte, à côté d'une autre tradition qui contenait 75 dans d'autres passages de Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5<sup>(11)</sup>. En Dt 10,22, le TM et la LXX sont d'accord pour le chiffre 70. Ce verset n'attire pas une attention particulière dans la tradition juive, il est reçu comme tel<sup>(12)</sup>. Barthélemy croit que cette leçon est originale dans la LXX<sup>(13)</sup>. Les mss de la LXX qui lisent 75 en Dt 10,22, comme l'Alexandrinus<sup>(14)</sup>, font donc une harmonisation, comme le TM fait une harmonisation en indiquant le chiffre 70 en Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5<sup>(15)</sup>.

(<sup>11</sup>) RÖMER, *Israels Väter*, 33.

(<sup>12</sup>) Ni la Mishna, ni le Talmud Babli ni le Yerushalmi ne citent Dt 10,22. Ce verset se trouve par contre dans les Targums qui ne le commentent pas. Les passages du Midrash Rabba qui le citent (NumR II,11; III,8; XIX,10; CantR VII,3,3; QohR IX,15,4) parlent simplement du premier recensement d'Israël. Rashi ne le commente pas.

(<sup>13</sup>) BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquné Sopherim», 300; C. DOGNIEZ – M. HARL, *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Le Deutéronome* (Paris 1992) V, 186, croient également que cette leçon contenue dans le Vaticanus est originale.

(<sup>14</sup>) Voir J. E. GRABE (ed.), *Septuaginta Interpretum, Tomus I Contens Octateuchum*; Quem Ex antiquissimo Ms Codice Alexandrino (Oxonii 1707). Pour d'autres mss, voir l'apparat critique de l'édition de Cambridge (BROOKE – MCLEAN), 588 et celle de Göttingen (WEVERS), 162.

(<sup>15</sup>) Pour ce dernier passage, on sait que deux mss de Qumrân, 4QGen-Exod<sup>a</sup> et 4QExod<sup>b</sup>, lisent également le chiffre 75. Voir E. ULRICH – F.M. CROSS, et. al., *Qumran Cave 4 VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII; Oxford 1994) 18,84. 4QGen-Exod<sup>a</sup> lit חמש ופנש [חמש], alors que 4QExod<sup>b</sup> lit חמש ופנש [חמש]. Le fait que le mot «cinq» soit mis respectivement avant et après le mot «soixante-dix» dans les deux mss fait penser à Davila, qui édite ce ms, que le mot «cinq» a été ajouté indépendamment dans les deux mss. Voir p. 19. A la p. 85, Cross dit que 4QExod<sup>b</sup> a une lecture secondaire par rapport à la leçon du texte massorétique. Voir également F. M. CROSS, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Minneapolis 1995) 135-136, où il dit que ce ms de Qumrân représente une «recensional reading» caractéristique de la Vorlage de la LXX. R.W. KLEIN, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament. From the Septuagint to Qumran* (la page de garde lit «The Septuagint after Qumran») (Philadelphia 1974) 15, dit que la lecture 70 est originale, alors que 75 est une correction. W.H.C. PROPP, *Exodus 1-18. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2; New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland 1999) 121-123, va dans le même sens.

Il est donc clair que la question des chiffres 75 et 70 divise les chercheurs. Je pars de l'hypothèse de Barthélemy, qui considère que le texte hébreu a changé 75 en 70 en Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5. Cette hypothèse me semble mieux expliquer la situation de Gn 46, 20-21 où la LXX a plus de noms que le TM. Dans ces deux versets, c'est le proto-massorétique qui aurait été retouché pour que le nombre de personnes citées corresponde à 70.

Cependant je suis attentif à l'hypothèse inverse qui veut que 75 soit secondaire. Alors que la tradition ancienne contenait 70, un chiffre rond; dans la

On voit qu'en dehors des questions de correction des chiffres, il y a une tradition ancienne qui veut que les Israélites aient été 70 lorsqu'ils descendirent d'Égypte<sup>(16)</sup>.

Depuis la découverte des mss de Qumrân et les études comme celles de Barthélemy, Vermes, Yadin et Milik sur les phylactères, on sait que Dt 10,22 faisait partie du contenu des plus anciens phylactères de Qumrân<sup>(17)</sup>. Or Milik date la coutume de porter les tefillin à l'époque maccabéenne, alors que les mezuzot seraient encore plus anciennes. Il signale que «ce furent probablement les autorités sacerdotales à Jérusalem qui fixèrent le choix des sections», même si la pratique restait «privée et semi-sacrée»<sup>(18)</sup>. Ceci pourrait n'être qu'une coïncidence, cependant, il est intéressant de remarquer que Dt 10,22 fait partie des textes mis en évidence à l'époque de la renaissance nationale, religieuse et littéraire, pour reprendre les termes de Milik<sup>(19)</sup>. Ce même texte a donc pu servir de base à l'harmonisation des données sur le nombre des fils d'Israël qui sont descendus en Égypte. Il faut rappeler que c'est à cette même époque hasmonéenne qu'on date une forte retouche du texte hébreu<sup>(20)</sup>.

Or, si nous considérons la symbolique du chiffre 70 en Israël,

---

*vorlage* de la LXX, on aurait compté les noms en Gn 46 et l'on aurait abouti à 75, un chiffre exact. Je serais donc d'accord avec G. VON RAD, *La Genèse* (traduction d'Etienne de Peyer) (Genève 1969) 411, qui dit qu'on a changé le contenu de Gn 46,8-27 pour que la liste reflète la situation au moment du départ de Jacob. Dans ce cas, il n'y aurait pas eu de correction de chiffres dans le proto-massorétique.

Il faut toutefois préciser que si le chiffre 75 était vraiment secondaire, et limité à la *vorlage* de la LXX ainsi qu'à quelques mss de Qumrân, cela renforcerait davantage la séparation que je préconise entre cette question de correction des chiffres et la correction en Dt 32,8.

<sup>(16)</sup> C'est pourquoi je pense qu'il faut d'emblée écarter l'idée qui voudrait que la correction de Dt 32,8 soit éventuellement à l'origine de l'insertion tardive de Dt 10,22.

<sup>(17)</sup> D. BARTHÉLEMY – J.T. MILIK, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I; Oxford 1955) 74; G. VERMES, «Pre-Mishnaic Jewish Worship and the Phylacteries from the Dead Sea», *VT* 9 (1959) 65-72; Y. YADIN, *Tefillin from Qumran (XQPhyl 1-4)* (Jerusalem 1969) 33; R. DE VAUX – T.J. MILIK, *Qumrân Grotte 4 II, I. Archéologie, II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128-4Q157)* (DJD IV; Oxford 1977) 38.

<sup>(18)</sup> DE VAUX – MILIK, *Qumrân Grotte 4 II*, 46-47.

<sup>(19)</sup> DE VAUX – MILIK, *Qumrân Grotte 4 II*, 46.

<sup>(20)</sup> Les Tiqquné Soferim traditionnels, mais également les autres retouches éditoriales identifiées. Voir A. SCHENKER, *Septante et Texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1Rois 2-14* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 48; Paris 2000).

comme dans son monde ambiant, à l'époque du deuxième Temple<sup>(21)</sup>, nous pouvons penser que Dt 10,22, qui contenait ce même chiffre, a pu jouer un grand rôle dans l'harmonisation textuelle. L'harmonisation des données sur le nombre des fils d'Israël se devait de suivre le chiffre indiqué par Dt 10,22 et non celui de Gn 46,27 ou Ex 1,5 puisque 75 n'avait pas une importance particulière<sup>(22)</sup>.

## 2. L'harmonisation des chiffres était possible sans tenir compte de Dt 32,8

Si Dt 10,22 a servi de base d'harmonisation des données sur le nombre des fils d'Israël qui sont descendus en Egypte, cette harmonisation a pu être indépendante d'une éventuelle correction ou non de Dt 32,8. Ces harmonisations n'avaient pas nécessairement besoin de ce verset pour être effectuées. En effet, l'on pouvait parler de 70 fils d'Israël en ignorant complètement Dt 32,8. La correction de 75 en 70 en Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 a donc pu être due à une harmonisation entre les données textuelles dans le proto-massorétique, le choix de 70 au détriment de 75 s'imposant à cause de l'importance de ce premier chiffre. Il n'est donc pas nécessaire de faire appel à la correction de Dt 32,8 pour expliquer celle des chiffres de Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5. La question du nombre des «fils de Dieu» en Dt 32,8 ne se pose pas à ce niveau.

## II. Etudier Dt 32,8 dans un autre contexte historico-théologique

### 1. L'expression «fils de Dieu» dans le sens d'anges de Dieu est une ancienne interprétation<sup>(23)</sup>

#### a) L'expression בני אלהים (fils de Dieu) dans la tradition manuscrite

L'expression utilisée en Dt 32,8 peut être étudiée en la rapprochant des autres occurrences de la même expression dans la Bible et dans le

<sup>(21)</sup> Voir M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy 1-11. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland 1991) 440-441.

<sup>(22)</sup> Sur la question des harmonisations, voir E. TOV, «The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts», *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3-29. Dans le cas précis du nombre des fils d'Israël, nous observons que l'harmonisation entre le Deutéronome et le Tetrateuque retient la leçon de ce premier même si elle est minoritaire.

<sup>(23)</sup> Ici nous ne parlons pas de l'expression מלאך (ה)אלהים «ange de Dieu» (Gn 21,17) ou מלאך יהוה «ange du Seigneur» (Gn 16,7). Cette expression, que nous

Pentateuque en particulier. Dans le TM, les passages qui ont l'expression בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu) sont Gn 6,2; 6,4; Job 1,6; 2,1; et Job 38,7 qui a בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים<sup>(24)</sup>. Dans tous ces textes la LXX traduit par ἄγγελοι (τοῦ) θεοῦ (anges de Dieu) avec quelques différences comme en Job 38,7 où elle lit ἄγγελοί μου (mes anges). La leçon υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (fils de Dieu) du ms Vaticanus dans les deux occurrences de Gn n'est pas prise en considération, puisque la partie ancienne de ce ms ne commence qu'en Gn 46,28 (= folio 41 du ms). On s'accorde à voir dans la lecture de cette partie tardive un retour à l'hébreu, la leçon ancienne étant ici représentée par le ms Alexandrinus et d'autres mss<sup>(25)</sup>. Théodotion s'accorde avec le TM, alors qu'Aquila rend l'expression par υἱοὶ τῶν θεῶν (fils des dieux). En Dt 32,8, l'un des mss qui contiennent le texte d'Aquila, le ms 85, lit également υἱῶν θεοῦ (fils de Dieu), alors que la majorité des mss contenant le texte d'Aquila s'accordent avec le TM «fils d'Israël»<sup>(26)</sup>. La Syro-Hexapla contient le mot *mlaka* (anges) en marge, qui suppose le même texte que la LXX ancienne<sup>(27)</sup>.

avons plus de 50 fois dans l'AT, représente un personnage souvent identifiable à Dieu lui-même. L'histoire de cette expression est probablement plus ancienne encore, puisque les sources textuelles l'attestent comme telle. Lorsqu'il y a des divergences textuelles, elles concernent le deuxième terme «Dieu» et non le premier «ange»!

<sup>(24)</sup> Nous laissons de côté l'expression בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils des dieux) que nous avons dans les Psaumes 29,1 et 89,7. Nous signalons simplement que les commentateurs anciens comme les modernes comprennent ces fils des dieux, comme des êtres célestes et non comme des humains. C'est également dans ce sens que les occurrences du Ps 82,1.6 sont comprises. Voir A. VAN DEN HOEK, «I Said, You are Gods... The Significance of Ps. 82 for Some Early Christian Authors», *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World* (éd. L.V. RUTGERS – P.W. VAN DER HORST – H.W. HAVELAAR – L. TEUGELS) (Contribution to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 22; Leuven 1998) 203-219. Voir encore 11QMelchisedek (11Q13). Pour la bibliographie voir F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR et. al, *Qumran Cave 11. II* 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31 (DJD XXIII; Oxford 1998) 221-241 et planche XXVII; F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Study Edition (Leiden – Boston – Köln – Grand Rapids/Michigan – Cambridge/UK 1998) II, 1206-1209.

<sup>(25)</sup> Voir l'apparat de l'édition de Göttingen. J. W. WEVERS (ed.), *Genesis. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum* (Göttingen 1974) I, 108.

<sup>(26)</sup> Voir F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta, Tomus I Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther* (Oxonii 1875, repr. Hildesheim 1964) 320, note 12. Voir également E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem 1997) 135, où il note: ἄγγέλων θεοῦ = Aquila.

<sup>(27)</sup> Voir FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, I, 22.

Dans les gloses marginales du Neofiti 1 nous avons le mot «anges», alors que son texte lit «fils de juges»<sup>(28)</sup>.

Philon d'Alexandrie dans *Gig.* II, 6<sup>(29)</sup>, lisait également les «anges de Dieu» à la suite de la LXX. Son commentaire allégorique, a cependant suscité quelques différences de compréhension. Les titres et les commentaires du traducteur en français, A. Moses, laissent comprendre que pour Philon ces êtres sont réellement des anges<sup>(30)</sup>. De son côté, Richard Goulet pense plutôt qu'il s'agit des hommes. Il se base sur *Gig.* II, 17 qui dit: «Il s'agit des méchants<sup>(31)</sup> qui, usurpant le nom d'ange, ne connaissent pas les filles de la raison...»<sup>(32)</sup>. Goulet commente ensuite: «Il ressort de ce passage que les anges sont dans ce verset le symbole des hommes méchants qui préfèrent le plaisir à la science et à la vertu»<sup>(33)</sup>. Si l'interprétation de Goulet était acceptée, Philon serait le témoin le plus ancien qui ramène les anges (fils) de Dieu de Gn 6,2 à la sphère humaine, même si ces humains ne sont pas encore identifiés aux juges ou aux notables de la tradition rabbinique.

On voit que dans les paragraphes 7-16 Philon s'efforce de répondre à l'accusation d'une conception mythique et superstitieuse en Gn 6,2. Dans plusieurs paragraphes (*Gig.* II, 6.16), il identifie les anges aux âmes dont certaines sont descendus dans le corps humain alors que les autres volent dans l'air. Mon impression est que cette interprétation de Philon se place entre la sphère divine et la sphère humaine. Elle sert de tremplin entre l'ancienne et la nouvelle interprétation des fils de Dieu. L'interprétation de Philon laisse penser qu'il n'a pas connu l'expression hébraïque בני אלהים (fils de Dieu).

Flavius Josèphe dans les *Antiquités Juives* I, 73<sup>(34)</sup> lit également «les anges de Dieu» en citant Gn 6,2. Cette lecture s'accorde avec celle de la LXX. Or, si l'on pense que Josèphe n'a pas connu le texte de la

<sup>(28)</sup> Voir plus loin cette interprétation qui est tardive.

<sup>(29)</sup> PHILON, *De Gigantibus, Œuvres*. Introduction, Traduction et Notes (éd. A. MOSES) (Paris 1963) VII, 24-25.

<sup>(30)</sup> PHILON, *De Gigantibus, Œuvres*, VII, 28-31.

<sup>(31)</sup> Moses rend ce mot par «les pervers».

<sup>(32)</sup> R. GOULET, *La philosophie de Moïse*. Essai de reconstitution d'un commentaire philosophique préphilonien du Pentateuque (Paris 1987) 199.

<sup>(33)</sup> GOULET, *La philosophie de Moïse*, 200.

<sup>(34)</sup> H.ST.J. THACKERAY, *Josephus with an English Translation. Jewish Antiquities, Book I-IV* (London – Cambridge – Massachusetts 1957) IV, 34-35. Le traducteur dit que la conception qui veut que ces fils de Dieu soient des membres des familles aristocrates a été imposée au 2<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. JC, pour éviter la mythologie.

LXX<sup>(35)</sup>, on peut néanmoins dire qu'il connaissait la même explication sur les fils de Dieu. De notre point de vue, on ne peut pas affirmer sans autres que Josèphe se base sur un texte hébreu מלאכי אלהים (anges de Dieu) à la place de בני אלהים (fils de Dieu)<sup>(36)</sup>. Puisque son texte est une paraphrase de la Bible<sup>(37)</sup>, il peut simplement avoir cité le texte biblique dans la forme que l'interprétation de son époque lui donnait. C'est un procédé targumique et midrashique connu. D'ailleurs le paragraphe suivant (§74), qui dit que Noé pressa les gens de sa génération de s'améliorer et qu'il dut quitter la région de peur d'être tué, montre que Josèphe n'hésite pas à élargir son texte comme le font ces mêmes sources rabbiniques<sup>(38)</sup>. Il reste surprenant qu'à la fin du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle Josèphe interprète encore les «fils de Dieu» comme signifiant «les anges de Dieu»<sup>(39)</sup>.

Le Talmud Babli, Yom 67b cite l'école de Rabbi Ishmaël qui parle d'Azazel en faisant allusion à l'histoire des anges déchus<sup>(40)</sup>. On peut penser que pour l'école de R. Ishmaël, la chute des anges est considérée comme un fait établi<sup>(41)</sup>, alors qu'à l'époque du même rabbin, R. Akiba refusait catégoriquement cette conception.

<sup>(35)</sup> Voir l'introduction d'Etienne Nodet dans F. JOSÈPHE, *Les Antiquités juives I*, Livres I-III, Texte, traduction et notes (Paris 1990) XXVIII.

<sup>(36)</sup> Contrairement à ce que pense E. Nodet, dans la note de sa traduction: F. JOSÈPHE, *Les Antiquités juives I*, 19, note 3; IDEM., *La Bible de Josèphe: Le Pentateuque* (Paris 1996) 57.

<sup>(37)</sup> Pour des exemples des écarts du texte de Josèphe par rapport au texte biblique, voir l'introduction d'Etienne Nodet dans F. JOSÈPHE, *Les Antiquités juives I*, B, XXIX.

<sup>(38)</sup> On remarque d'ailleurs assez souvent que Josèphe interprète la Bible conformément au contexte historique dans lequel il vivait. Voir par exemple *Ant.* IV, 207 où il tolère les dieux étrangers, alors que Dt 7,25 prescrit leur destruction. Ce qui est étonnant chez Josèphe, c'est qu'il dit qu'il n'ajoute rien ou n'omet rien de ce qu'avait écrit Moïse. Cfr *Ant.* IV, 196-197. Pour une vue plus large de l'attitude de Josèphe face à l'écriture, voir L.H. FELDMAN, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Supplements of the Journal for the Study of Judaism 58, Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998). Pour l'histoire de Noé, voir 17-37.

<sup>(39)</sup> Josèphe s'oppose-t-il à la nouvelle interprétation qui veut que ces fils de Dieu soient des «fils des juges ou des grands»?

<sup>(40)</sup> Ce nom est une variante d'Azaël. Voir ci-dessous les données du *Tg. Ps.-J.* Voir également Hen(aeth) 6,7; 8,1, etc.

<sup>(41)</sup> Voir également la note 1 de la traduction anglaise du *Tg. Onq. B.* GROSSFELD, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis, Translation, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 6; Wilmington, DE 1988) 52. (Cette note cite bYom 7b probablement par erreur, au lieu de bYom 67b).

Il faut rappeler que les livres apocryphes anciens contiennent la même conception. Hen(aeth) 6,2 dit «Les anges, fils du ciel» et Jub 5,1 dit «les anges du Seigneur». Ces témoignages attestent l'ancienneté de cette interprétation<sup>(42)</sup>.

En Gn 6,4, le *Tg. Ps.-J.* garde deux traditions puisque après avoir traduit «fils des grands» en Gn 6,2, ce targum cite les noms de ceux qui sont tombés des cieux: Shemhazai et Azaël. Cela montre que cette tradition targumique connaissait l'ancienne interprétation qui veut que les fils de Dieu soient ses anges. Cependant, en adoptant la nouvelle interprétation, qui veut que ces personnages soient les fils des grands, donc des humains, elle n'exclut pas complètement l'ancienne<sup>(43)</sup>.

Un passage du Midrash Rabba (ExodR 32,7) laisse comprendre que les nations sont gouvernés par les anges. Ce texte commente le songe de Jacob en Gn 28,12 et cite Dt 32,8 pour souligner la particularité d'Israël. Dans ce texte, l'ange de la mort reçoit le pouvoir sur les nations mais pas sur Israël. Plus loin, il est dit que Dieu a montré à Jacob les anges gardiens de chaque empire<sup>(44)</sup>. Ce texte suppose donc également l'ancienne interprétation.

La tradition samaritaine connaît également la même interprétation. Lorsque le Memar Marqah commente Dt 32,8 dans sa forme actuelle qui lit «fils d'Israël», il signale que les nations sont guidées par les

<sup>(42)</sup> Ces livres interprètent le texte biblique «fils de Dieu». Voir J.C. VANDERKAM, «The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch», *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape and Interpretation* (ed. P. W. FLINT) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 2001) 129-148. L'auteur est contre l'idée selon laquelle c'est Gn qui interpréterait Hen. Voir spécialement 132-134.

Noter que le livre des *AntBib* ne fait aucune allusion à la chute des anges. Voir la note de J. HADOT, *Le livre des Antiquités bibliques, Écrits Intertestamentaires* (ed. A. DUPONT-SOMMER – M. PHILONENKO) (Paris 1987) 1237, note sur III,1. Pour le nombre des fils d'Israël qui sont descendus en Egypte, le livre des *AntBib* 8,11 parle de 72. La phrase qui contient ce chiffre est mal placée, parce qu'elle donne déjà la somme des descendants de Jacob, alors que leur liste continue. Le chiffre 72 est également connu dans la version hébraïque du livre d'Hen XVII,6.8 qui parle respectivement de 72 anges grands et honorables, ainsi que 72 princes des nations correspondant aux 72 langues du monde. Voir H. ODEBERG, *3 Henoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Edited and Translated for the First Time with Introduction Commentary & Critical Notes (New York 1974) Part II, 48-50. Ce chiffre ne se trouve ni dans les témoins du TM ni dans ceux de la LXX. Peut-on penser que les auteurs qui ont 72 cherchent à avoir un multiple de 12 (tribus), alors que ceux qui ont 70 insistent sur sa symbolique de totalité et de sainteté?

<sup>(43)</sup> Probablement involontairement?

<sup>(44)</sup> Un texte plus ou moins parallèle se trouve en LevR 29,2.



étoiles, alors qu'Israël a la loi de Dieu. Même si cette interprétation parle d'étoiles et non d'anges, elle laisse transparaître l'interprétation des êtres célestes qui sont en charge des nations<sup>(45)</sup> La notion des astres données aux nations est d'ailleurs connue en Dt 4,19<sup>(46)</sup>.

b) Dt 32,8 et les בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu)

Si plusieurs témoins textuels lisent בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (fils d'Israël) comme le TM, Sm, etc., nous savons maintenant que cette leçon est une correction théologique délibérée et tardive. La LXX rend la même expression par ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ (anges de Dieu)<sup>(47)</sup> comme si le traducteur avait sous les yeux la leçon בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu) des autres occurrences citées.

Deux mss de Qumrân, 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>, et 4QDeut<sup>j</sup>, contiennent respectivement l'expression בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים<sup>(48)</sup> et בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu) en Dt 32,8. Dans ce dernier fragment qui contient Dt 32,7-8, l'expression en question est bien claire et ne peut porter à aucune confusion<sup>(49)</sup>.

C'est principalement sur ces témoignages que Barthélemy s'est basé pour l'affirmation de la correction dans le TM. Même si ces témoins sont minoritaires, ils sont également plus anciens. Ils reflètent l'état du texte avant la correction. On peut donc reconnaître que la leçon בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu) est la plus ancienne en Dt 32,8. Toutes les

<sup>(45)</sup> Voir J. MACDONALD (ed.), *Memar Marqah*, The Teaching of Marqah (BZAW 84; Berlin 1963) I: The Text, 106; II: The Translation, 176-177. Voir également S. LOWY, *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis* (Leiden 1977) 143. Il faut remarquer que dans ce passage du Memar Marqah, le nombre des fils d'Israël est compris dans un sens particulier qui n'a rien à voir avec les 70 qui sont descendus en Egypte. Après avoir cité Dt 32,8, le texte commente: «Tes descendants seront comme les étoiles du ciel (Gn 22,17), douze en haut et douze en bas. Lowy pense que les douze d'en haut sont les signes de zodiaque correspondant aux douze d'en bas qui sont les tribus d'Israël.

<sup>(46)</sup> Ce sujet a été débattu par Justin et Tryphon. Voir JUSTIN MARTYR, *Dialogue avec le juif Tryphon*, 55,1. Voir également ci-dessous au sujet de la défense du monothéisme.

<sup>(47)</sup> Pour le premier terme, je ne restitue pas la forme génitive due à la préposition qui précède.

<sup>(48)</sup> P.W. SKEHAN, «A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut, 32) from Qumran», *BASOR* 136 (1954) 12-15. C'est cette ancienne lecture בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים que bon nombre d'auteurs retiennent encore aujourd'hui. Or Skehan dit clairement qu'on ne peut pas affirmer que le ל s'arrête à la fin du mot ou pas.

<sup>(49)</sup> P.W. SKEHAN, «Qumran and the Present State of the Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text», *JBL* 78 (1959) 21-25; E. ULRICH et. al., *Qumran Cave 4 IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford 1995) 75-91. Voir spécialement 90 et planche XXIII, photo 34.

autres lectures ne sont que ses interprétations. Dans le point précédent, nous avons remarqué que l'interprétation la plus ancienne est celle qui identifie ces fils de Dieu aux anges de Dieu.

On ne doit donc pas mettre cette lecture interprétative face à celle du TM comme une leçon éventuellement concurrente et alternative. Nous ne pensons pas que le traducteur de la LXX eût sous les yeux une *Vorlage* hébraïque qui contenait מלאכי אלהים (anges de Dieu). Cette lecture est le fruit d'une interprétation. L'intérêt de la lecture de la LXX réside plutôt dans la chronologie de son application ainsi que dans l'identification de la leçon ancienne du TM <sup>(50)</sup>.

Le *Tg. Ps.-J.* nous offre une autre interprétation qui s'accorde avec cette leçon ancienne. C'est dans son commentaire sur Genèse 11,8 «La Parole de Yahvé se manifesta sur la ville et avec lui les soixante-dix anges correspondant aux soixante-dix peuples, chacun ayant avec lui la langue de son peuple et dans sa main les caractères de son écriture» <sup>(51)</sup>. Dans le texte biblique, la correspondance entre le nombre d'anges et celui des peuples ne se trouve qu'en Dt 32,8. On ne peut donc pas s'empêcher de penser que le Targum fait allusion à ce même passage.

## 2. Comprendre fils de Dieu comme fils d'Israël (Dt 32,8) est une interprétation tardive

### a) Les בני אלהים (fils de Dieu) en tant qu'êtres humains

La deuxième interprétation, qui date du premier siècle ap. JC est celle qui considère que les fils de Dieu sont en fait les «fils de juges» ou «les fils des grands ou des puissants», c'est-à-dire des dignitaires ou de la classe aristocratique. Cette interprétation veut limiter ces êtres à la sphère humaine <sup>(52)</sup>. C'est l'interprétation que nous avons dans le *Tgs. Onq., Neof., Ps.-J.* ainsi que dans le Midrash GenR 26,5, qui commente Gn 6,2, où Rabbi Shim'on ben Yoḥai (2è s) insiste sur le sens «fils des juges» et maudit quiconque les appellerait fils de Dieu <sup>(53)</sup>. Ce tanna était élève d'Akiba. Or, celui-ci défendait la même

<sup>(50)</sup> J.W. WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (MSU XIII, Göttingen 1978) 85, qualifie l'interprétation «anges de Dieu» en Dt 32,8 de «popular reading».

<sup>(51)</sup> Traduction de R. LE DÉAUT, *Le Targum du Pentateuque: Genèse* (SC 245; Paris 1978) I, 145. Le texte du *Pseudo-Jonathan* suit le ms Add. 27031.

<sup>(52)</sup> Le Psaume 82 qui parle des «fils du Très Haut» dans leur fonction de juges a dû jouer un grand rôle dans cette interprétation.

<sup>(53)</sup> Etienne Nodet rapporte exactement le contraire de ce qu'enseigne ce

position en rejetant une conception mythologique qui unirait les êtres divins aux êtres humains<sup>(54)</sup>. La recension grecque de Symmaque s'accorde avec l'interprétation juive de son époque. Symmaque lit  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma$   $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma$  (fils des puissants)<sup>(55)</sup> comme le font les témoins déjà cités.

La tradition rabbinique justifiera cette nouvelle conception par le fait que le mot Elohim n'est pas limité à Dieu, mais qu'il évoque surtout l'idée de suprématie. Dans ce sens Rashi donnait l'exemple d'Ex 4,16 où Moïse est l'Elohim d'Aaron, ainsi qu'Ex 7,1 où Moïse est l'Elohim du Pharaon. Les autres auteurs du Moyen Âge comme Ibn Ezra et Ramban (Moshe ben Nachman) parlent également de «fils de juges ou fils de princes». D'ailleurs les *Tgs. Onq., Neof., Ps.-J.*, ainsi que certains midrashim comme la Mechilta d' Rabbi Ishmaël, Mechilta d'Nazikin, parlent de «juges» en Ex 21,6 et 22,7 au lieu du mot hébreu  $\text{אלהים}$  (Dieu)<sup>(56)</sup>. La Syriacque a également la leçon «juges». Les Pirkè de Rabbi Eliezer XXII expliquent que ce sont les anges qui sont tombés du ciel qui ont corrompu les filles de la génération de Caïn<sup>(57)</sup>. Certains auteurs modernes juifs expliquent également que ces fils de Dieu sont des anges<sup>(58)</sup>. Cependant cette lecture est un retour à l'ancienne interprétation qu'ils jugent plus vraisemblable.

La nouvelle interprétation qui limite les fils de Dieu à la sphère humaine visait à écarter toute idée de mythologie. Nous avons

---

rabbin, lorsqu'il écrit que celui-ci défend la leçon  $\text{מלאכי}$ . Voir NODET, *La Bible de Josèphe*, 57. En effet, le texte du GenR 26,5 dit:  $\text{ר' שמעון בן יוחאי קרי להון בני דיניא ר' שמעון בן יוחאי מקלל לכל מאן דקרי להון בני אלהיא}$  (Rabbi Shim'on ben Yohai les appelle «fils des juges». Rabbi Shim'on ben Yohai maudit quiconque les appelle «fils de Dieu»). On dira donc que Shim'on ben Yohai connaît bien la leçon  $\text{בני אלהים}$  (fils de Dieu). Cependant il interprète ces fils de Dieu et demande de les comprendre comme signifiant «fils des juges». La leçon  $\text{מלאכי אלהים}$  (anges de Dieu) est donc absente de ses propos.

<sup>(54)</sup> Voir les notes de GROSSFELD, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, 52.

<sup>(55)</sup> Voir FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, I, 22; W. WEVERS (ed.), *Genesis*, 108.

<sup>(56)</sup> E. E. URBACH, *Les sages d'Israël. Conceptions et croyances des maîtres du Talmud* (traduit de l'hébreu par Marie-José Jolivet) (Paris 1996) 770, note 131, dit que les targums ont tenu compte de la malédiction de Shim'on ben Yohai.

<sup>(57)</sup> Voir G. FREEDLANDER (ed.), *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (New York 1971).

<sup>(58)</sup> U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part I: From Adam to Noah* (Jerusalem 1978) 291-295; N. SARNA, *Genesis* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia – New York – Jerusalem 5749/1989) 45. Pour ces auteurs, parler de fils de juges ou de dignitaires ne s'impose pas. Il faut, cependant, souligner qu'il y a d'autres comme Beno Jacob qui soutiennent la compréhension des fils de Dieu comme des humains. Voir B. JACOB, *Das Erste Buch der Tora. Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin 1934) 170-173.

remarqué que Philon a dû se défendre également contre les accusation de mythe et de superstition que la première interprétation pouvait véhiculer.

c) Dt 32,8 et la nouvelle interprétation des בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (fils de Dieu)

Comme nous l'avons vu, en Dt 32,8 la leçon la plus ancienne lisait bien «fils de Dieu» comme en Gn 6,2. La leçon actuelle du TM qui a «fils d'Israël» est donc une correction. La lecture de la LXX qui a «les anges de Dieu» est également une interprétation mais plus ancienne<sup>(59)</sup> que la leçon actuelle du TM. D'ailleurs la LXX suppose la leçon hébraïque ancienne «fils de Dieu», puisque sa lecture est une interprétation ou une explication de la même réalité, alors que celle du TM change la nature de ces êtres.

Le *Tg. Onq.* dit: «selon le nombre des fils d'Israël». Il suit de près le TM. Le *Tg. Neof.* ainsi que les mss fragmentaires Vatican Ebr 440, 264, Paris 110, lisent «selon le nombre des tribus des fils d'Israël»<sup>(60)</sup>.

Comme cela était le cas en Gn 6,2-4, en Dt 32,8, le *Tg. Ps.-J.* mélange les deux interprétations, puisque son texte parle d'anges de Dieu et des fils d'Israël. Ce texte dit: «Quand le Très Haut donna le monde en héritage aux peuples qui étaient issus des fils de Noé, quand il répartit les écritures et les langues entre les fils de l'homme, dans la génération de la division, en ce temps-là il tira au sort avec les soixante-dix anges, princes des peuples, avec lesquels il s'était manifesté pour voir la cité; et à ce moment-là, il établit les frontières des nations d'après le nombre total des soixante-dix personnes d'Israël qui descendirent en Egypte»<sup>(61)</sup>.

Nous avons remarqué qu'en Gn 11,8 le *Tg. Ps.-J.* parle de 70 anges correspondant aux 70 peuples. Ici, ce Targum déplace le centre

<sup>(59)</sup> Un certain nombre de mss de la *Vetus Latina* lisent également «selon le nombre des anges de Dieu». Voir T. AYUSO MARAZUELA, *La Vetus Latina Hispana: Octateuco* (Madrid 1967) 266-267. S. R. DRIVER, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1902) 356, disait que cette lecture «les anges de Dieu» est une anticipation de la conception de l'ange gardien de Dn 10,13.20.21; 12,1; Sir 17,17.

<sup>(60)</sup> M. KLEIN, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to the Extant Sources* (AnBib 76; Rome 1980) I: Texts, Indices and Introductory Essays, 226; II: Translation, 183; A. DIEZ MACHO (ed.), *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum*. Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio (Biblia Polyglotta Matritensis 4; Matriti 1980) 268-269.

<sup>(61)</sup> Pour le texte araméen, voir DIEZ MACHO (ed.), *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum*, 269. La traduction française est celle de R. LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque: Deutéronome* (SC 271; Paris 1980) IV, 267.

d'intérêt vers les 70 Israélites, alors que l'établissement des frontières des nations est antérieur à l'existence même d'Israël<sup>(62)</sup>. Tout en gardant en mémoire l'histoire de la descente de Dieu avec les 70 anges, le targumiste lit «fils d'Israël» en Dt 32,8 et tente de concilier les deux.

Pourquoi avoir changé l'expression «fils de Dieu» en «fils d'Israël» après qu'on ait rejeté la première interprétation «anges de Dieu»? La comparaison avec les autres passages bibliques du Pentateuque qui contiennent la même expression ou la même idée (Ex 21,6; 22,7) montre qu'il n'est pas possible d'interpréter «fils de Dieu» comme «fils de juges» ou «fils de grands» en Dt 32,8. Ni la structure ni le contexte de ce verset ne permettent une telle interprétation. Il n'existe pas de tradition sur laquelle on peut se baser pour parler du nombre des «fils de notables» ou des «juges». En plus, Dt 32,8 ne permet pas de faire une distinction entre les couches de la même population. Puisque la nouvelle interprétation n'est pas applicable à Dt 32,8 en laissant le texte tel quel, il fallait donc le corriger. La correction n'était pas nécessaire pour les autres passages qui contenaient la même expression, parce qu'il est possible de limiter ces mêmes passages à la sphère humaine sans devoir changer leur texte.

La nouvelle interprétation devenait, par la force des choses, le texte biblique lui-même en Dt 32,8. Cette interprétation, «les fils d'Israël», tombait bien, d'une part parce que les Israélites ne sont que des humains, et d'autre part, parce que le chiffre 70 des fils d'Israël qui sont descendus en Egypte était déjà attesté en Dt 10,22.

Il faut d'ailleurs remarquer que Dt 32,8 pouvait être corrigé en «fils d'Israël» sans tenir compte de l'harmonisation des chiffres de Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 avec Dt 10,22. En effet, Gn 10 et Dt 10,22 suffisaient pour lui donner une base solide lui permettant d'envisager les 70 fils d'Israël correspondant aux 70 peuples<sup>(63)</sup>. Barthélemy a d'ailleurs fait remarquer, avec raison à mon avis, que la glose du *Tg. Ps.-J.* qui utilise le verbe «descendirent» se réfère à Dt 10,22, puisque c'est le seul

<sup>(62)</sup> Je reconnais que la chronologie ne joue pas toujours un rôle dans les interprétations rabbiniques. Voir par exemple GenR 46,7 où Abraham et Sem sont contemporains. Cependant, dans la tradition juive ancienne, je n'ai pas encore trouvé un dit «prophétique» explicite qui dit que Dieu savait déjà, avant les débuts du peuple d'Israël avec Abraham, qu'il y aurait 70 fils d'Israël qui descendront en Egypte. Les commentaires rabbiniques sur Gn 15,13, qui annonce le séjour en Egypte, ne précisent pas le nombre de ceux qui y descendront.

<sup>(63)</sup> On sait qu'aucune source, si divergente soit-elle, ne donne 75 noms en Gn 10. Les variantes donnent 71 unités. Voir BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquné Sopherim», 296, note 5.

passage qui caractérise ainsi l'entrée en Egypte des 70 pères du peuple d'Israël.

L'interprétation tardive qui limite les «fils de Dieu» à la sphère humaine en les désignant comme «fils d'Israël» a d'ailleurs posé quelques problèmes de compréhension. Certains Targums ont dû ajouter une explication pour préciser que ce sont les «tribus des fils d'Israël» en pensant probablement que les «fils d'Israël» eux-mêmes sont plus nombreux que 70. D'autres Targums précisent «soixante-dix personnes d'Israël qui descendirent en Egypte» pour faire référence à une époque fixe dans l'histoire du même peuple. Le *Tg. Onq.* est le seul qui n'ajoute pas d'explications <sup>(64)</sup>.

### 3. La correction vise-t-elle la défense du monothéisme?

La conception du monothéisme aurait-elle été gênée par l'interprétation «anges de Dieu»? Non. L'ancienne forme textuelle qui garde l'expression בני אלהים (fils de Dieu) telle quelle, subordonne déjà les autres dieux à YHWH comme l'explique Adrian Schenker. YHWH est le Très Haut qui transcende les autres dieux <sup>(65)</sup>. Le monothéisme n'est donc pas en jeu à ce niveau. En expliquant les «fils de Dieu» comme les «anges de Dieu», la question était déjà réglée. En effet, à partir du moment où ceux qui sont en charge des nations sont des messagers et donc des sujets de Dieu (le Très Haut), l'idée du monothéisme est préservée. Il n'était donc pas nécessaire de corriger le texte ancien de Dt 32,8 («fils de Dieu») puisque son interprétation («anges de Dieu») allait exactement dans la ligne théologique acceptée. Dans ce sens, on peut également citer Dt 4,19, qui parle des astres comme la part que le Seigneur a donnés aux peuples. Dans ce passage, les astres sont également commandés par Dieu <sup>(66)</sup>.

<sup>(64)</sup> A l'époque moderne, Jeffrey H. Tigay reconnaît que la forme hébraïque actuelle pose encore quelques difficultés qui disparaissent lorsqu'on lit la forme grecque et celle de 4QDeut<sup>h</sup>. Il signale par exemple qu'Israël n'existait pas encore, il se demande pourquoi Dieu aurait basé sa division sur le nombre des Israélites au moment d'entrer en Egypte, etc. Voir J.H. TIGAY, *Deuteronomy* דברים. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia – Jerusalem 5756/1996) 302-303. Voir également son excursus 31, pp. 513-518 où il considère également qu'en Dt 32,43, la référence aux anges a été enlevée dans le texte hébreu.

<sup>(65)</sup> SCHENKER, «Le monothéisme israélite», 438-441.

<sup>(66)</sup> Cependant, ce verset est également dans la ligne de mire de la tradition juive (Talmud Babli, Meg 9a) qui dit que les traducteurs en grec ont précisé que Dieu a réparti les astres «pour éclairer» toutes les nations. Cet ajout «pour

Par contre, lorsqu'on a rejeté la conception mythologique qui voulait que les êtres célestes puissent se reproduire avec les humains, l'interprétation qui voulaient que les «fils de Dieu» soient les «anges de Dieu» est devenue dangereuse. C'est également à ce moment-là qu'il faut placer l'intérêt de corriger Dt 32,8.

Ce phénomène est le même dans la LXX qui lisait directement l'ancienne interprétation dans son texte. On peut dire la même chose de tous les témoins qui lisaient la même interprétation comme Jub 5,1; Hen(aeth) 6,1; 7,1; Hen(gr) 18,4; TestXII.Naph 3,5; GenR 26,5; DeutR 11,10<sup>(67)</sup>, Philon et Josèphe. C'est également ce que nous trouvons plus tard dans les textes qui ont adopté la nouvelle interprétation comme la Syriacque pour Ex 21,6 et 22,7 où le mot אֱלֹהִים (Dieu) est directement rendu par «les juges», ou dans les Targums pour Gn 6,2, Ex 21,6; 22,7 etc. où le mot «juges» est directement lu comme s'il était le texte biblique.

Dans l'ancienne interprétation, on modifiait le premier terme de l'expression «Fils de Dieu» pour distinguer nettement ces derniers de Dieu lui-même<sup>(68)</sup>. C'est plus tard que dans la deuxième interprétation l'on modifiait plutôt le deuxième terme, pour limiter ces êtres à la sphère terrestre et humaine.

Dans ce cas, la correction aurait visé, non pas d'abord la défense du monothéisme, celui-ci étant assuré depuis longtemps<sup>(69)</sup> (le Très

---

éclairer», aurait été fait pour ne pas laisser croire que Dieu favorise le culte des astres. Nous savons qu'aucune source manuscrite de la LXX n'atteste cet ajout. E. Tov pense que cet ajout a pu réellement exister mais qu'il se basait sur une variante hébraïque. Cependant, D. Barthélemy pense qu'en plus des divergences existantes, les rabbins ont ajouté «des modifications qu'il eut été prudent de faire subir au texte, avant de le livrer aux mains des Grecs». Voir E. Tov, «The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations' inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX», *JSJ* 15 (1984) 65-89 (= E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* [Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999] 1-20); D. BARTHÉLEMY, «Eusèbe, la Septante et «les autres», *La Bible et les Pères*: colloque de Strasbourg (1<sup>er</sup> – 3 octobre 1969) (Paris 1971) 51-65 (= BARTHÉLEMY, *Etudes d'histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 179-193. Voir 191). Voir également M. HARL – G. DORIVAL – O. MUNNICH, *La Bible grecque des Septante*. Du Judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien (Paris 1994) 209-210.

<sup>(67)</sup> Le livre des *AntBib* ne mentionne pas la chute des anges. Il contient l'expression: Fils de Dieu. Voir LAB 3,1. Ce livre a-t-il été corrigé à l'époque d'Akiba qui refusa la légitimité de la légende des anges déchus?

<sup>(68)</sup> Faut-il voir ici une évolution liée à la confrontation avec l'hellénisme, ce qui expliquerait pourquoi l'interprétation devient le texte lui-même dans la LXX?

<sup>(69)</sup> Barthélemy signale que pour un israélite de l'époque classique, les Fils de

Haut est le Dieu d'Israël), mais la volonté de rejeter la conception mythologique qui unit les êtres divins aux humains. Du même coup, Dt 32,8 devait être corrigé non pas parce qu'il parlait de cette union, mais parce qu'il contenait l'expression en question.

Peut-on penser qu'il y a eu un texte hébreu qui lisait directement «les anges de Dieu» ou plus tard un autre qui lisait «les fils de notables ou de juges» en Gn 6 ou encore «les juges» en Ex 21 et 22? A l'état actuel de nos recherches, nous ne le croyons pas. Les seuls témoignages que nous ayons sont en grec et en araméen, et nous jugeons ces témoignages comme des interprétations qui sont devenues le texte lui-même<sup>(70)</sup>.

### III. Qu'en est-il des «fils de Dieu» en Job et en Daniel?

Dans le livre de Job, il serait difficile de limiter les «fils de Dieu» à la sphère humaine. Le Talmud Babli, Hul 91b-92a, et BB 15b-16a, cite les passages de Job (1,6; 2,1) qui parlent de la réunion à laquelle assistent les fils de Dieu, et à laquelle Satan prend également part. Le Midrash, GenR 65,21, cite Job 38,7 où il est question du chant de joie des fils de Dieu. Tous ces textes nous expliquent que les fils de Dieu sont les anges.

La leçon «les anges» est également retenue par le texte de Job dans la LXX, la Syriacque et le Targum<sup>(71)</sup>.

Le *Targum de Job* découvert à Qumrân (11QtgJob = 11Q10) conserve le texte de Job 38,7 qui lit מלאכי אלהים (anges de Dieu)<sup>(72)</sup>.

---

Dieu et Yahvé ne se situent plus sur le même plan. BARTHÉLEMY, «Les Tiquné Sopherim», 296. C'est ce que défend également SCHENKER, «Le monothéisme israélite», 438.

<sup>(70)</sup> E.E. URBACH, *Les sages d'Israël*, 146, observe le même phénomène dans le changement de l'expression «ange du Seigneur» par «Shekhina (présence de Dieu) dans les écrits juifs. Il ajoute: «les sages ont souvent complètement omis de leurs commentaires les mot ange comme s'il était absent du texte».

<sup>(71)</sup> C'est dans une forme légèrement différente: La LXX lit «mes anges», la Syriacque lit «fils des anges», le *Targum de Job* lit «les anges» ici et en 2,1. Le *Targum de Job* a une autre forme en 1,6: «fils des anges». Voir F.J. FERNÁNDEZ VALLINA, *El Targum de Job* (Madrid 1982); C. MANGAN, *The Targum of Job*. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes (The Aramaic Bible 15; Collegeville, MN 1991); D.M. STEG, *The Text of the Targum of Job*. An Introduction and Critical Edition (Leiden – New York – Köln 1994).

<sup>(72)</sup> GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – TIGCHELAAR et. al, *Qumran Cave 11*, 149-151 et planche XVI; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, II, 1196-1197.



L'identité de Satan, considéré comme un ange de la destruction et un accusateur des humains<sup>(73)</sup>, a probablement joué un grand rôle dans le maintien de l'ancienne interprétation juive qui veut que des fils de Dieu soient au fond les anges de Dieu. Si Satan, dont la qualité d'ange ne peut être mis en doute, assiste à une réunion dans laquelle il discute avec Dieu, cette réunion ne peut être humaine. Dans le livre de Job, il n'y a pas une interprétation qui veut que les fils de Dieu soient des humains<sup>(74)</sup>.

Dans le livre de Dn nous avons la même expression que celle que nous étudions, bien qu'elle soit au singulier et en araméen. Dn 3,25 (= 3,92 grec) contient l'expression בְּרִאֲלֵהִין (fils de Dieu). La traduction grecque de la LXX attestée par Origène lit «ange de Dieu», alors que celle de Théodotion contient «fils de Dieu» comme dans le TM<sup>(75)</sup>. Selon les commentaires du Midrash Rabba (ExodR 20,10 et DeutR 1,12), le fils de Dieu de Dn 3,25 est un ange.

L'interprétation tardive qui identifie les fils de Dieu aux humains ne peut donc pas s'appliquer à Dn 3,25. En effet, la quatrième personne dont il est question dans ce récit et qui ressemble à un fils de Dieu est différente des trois autres. Nous savons, par ailleurs, que les trois humains dont il est question étaient des fils des nobles d'Israël (Dn 1,3-7). Or, si la quatrième est différente, les trois premiers ne peuvent être identifiés aux «fils de Dieu». Il n'est donc pas possible d'interpréter le fils de Dieu dont il est question ici comme un humain.

#### IV. Synthèse

(1) *L'interprétation de l'expression «fils de Dieu» a évolué dans le temps.* Nous avons remarqué qu'il y a une évolution dans la manière

<sup>(73)</sup> Voir le Midrash LevR 6,3, où R. Samuel ben Nahman compte Satan parmi les anges de la destruction. Voir également EstR 8,13 où selon R. Ishmaël, Satan accuse devant Dieu les 18500 Israélites qui ont accepté de participer au banquet d'Ahasuérus, et qui se sont enivrés et méconduits, alors que Mardochee les avait mis en garde.

<sup>(74)</sup> En commentant le début du livre de Job, dans le Talmud Babli, BB 15b, Rabbi Yoḥanan fait un rapprochement curieux. Il dit: Quelle est l'importance des mots: Et il arriva aux jours du jugement des juges [Ruth 1,1]? C'était une génération qui a jugé ses juges». Or, dans le Targum de Job, les versets 1,6 et 2,1 commencent par «et au jour du jugement». Avons-nous dans ce talmud le vestige d'une tentative d'interpréter les fils de Dieu du livre de Job comme des juges?

<sup>(75)</sup> Voir J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta, Vol XVI, pars II, Göttingen 1954) 133. Comme Ziegler le fait pour le texte de Daniel, Rahlfs avait également édité les deux textes côte à côte.

d'interpréter les «fils de Dieu». L'interprétation ancienne voulait que ces derniers soient des «anges de Dieu». Les écrits les plus anciens interprètent l'expression dans ce sens. Il s'agit de la LXX, et d'autres livres comme Hen et les Jub qui datent de l'époque pré-chrétienne. Cette interprétation était encore valable jusqu'à la fin du premier siècle. Flavius Josèphe en est le témoin important.

La deuxième interprétation qui n'a pourtant pas attendu la fin du premier siècle pour être fortement soulignée est celle qui considérait que les fils de Dieu étaient au fond les fils des juges ou des grands. Cette deuxième interprétation visait à rejeter les accusations selon lesquelles le récit biblique contient des mythologies.

Nous avons remarqué qu'une interprétation intermédiaire, celle de Philon, expliquait les anges de Dieu comme les âmes dont certaines sont dans les corps humains, alors que d'autres volent dans l'air. Philon ne connaissait pas encore la conception qui identifie les fils de Dieu aux juges ou aux dignitaires.

L'observation de ces deux interprétations montre que dans un premier temps, on interprétait le premier terme de l'expression «fils de Dieu» (fils = anges), alors que dans un deuxième temps, on réhabilitait le premier et l'on interprétait le deuxième (Dieu = juges).

(2) *Ce n'est pas le monothéisme qui était en jeu, mais les idées mythologiques.* La question du monothéisme a pu être posée dans le cadre de la première interprétation, les fils de Dieu étant compris comme ses anges, et donc ses sujets. A ce niveau, Dt 32,8 n'avait pas encore besoin d'être corrigé comme il est dans le TM.

C'est à l'époque où l'on rejetait l'idée mythologique de l'union entre les êtres divins et humains qu'on a ramené la conception des «fils de Dieu» à la sphère humaine. C'est également à cette époque qu'on peut dater la correction de Dt 32,8. Ce *tiqqûn* aurait été introduit au premier siècle ap. JC. Le fait que le Pentateuque samaritain contienne la même leçon implique également une correction. Les milieux de ces deux sources étaient confrontés au même problème et ne s'ignoraient pas<sup>(76)</sup>.

(3) *Seul Dt 32,8 devait être corrigé.* L'interprétation qui identifie les fils de Dieu aux humains est limitée au Pentateuque. Les autres passages bibliques qui contiennent la même expression ne peuvent être interprétés dans le même sens.

<sup>(76)</sup> J. E. SANDERSON, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran. 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta, Georgia, 1986) 32.

Dt 32,8 a la particularité d'avoir intégré la nouvelle interprétation dans le texte biblique lui-même, alors que d'autres passages du Pentateuque laissent l'expression «fils de Dieu» ou «Dieu» en les comprenant comme des humains. Ceci s'explique par le fait que Dt 32,8 est le seul passage qui n'accepterait pas cette application sans être modifié. Que ces fils de Dieu soient des humains, ils ne peuvent être identifiés aux juges ou aux dignitaires, comme c'est le cas dans d'autres passages du Pentateuque. La bonne solution était de préciser, dans le texte de Dt 32,8, qu'ils sont les fils d'Israël.

(4) *Il faut séparer la question des éventuelles retouches en Gn 46,27; Ex 1,5 et celle de la correction de Dt 32,8.* Tout ce parcours a montré que la question des corrections harmonisantes des données sur le nombre des fils d'Israël, au moment d'entrer en Egypte, peut être détachée de Dt 32,8. Le chiffre 70 n'a pas été inventé, il se trouvait déjà en Dt 10,22, un des passages importants à l'époque de la renaissance religieuse et la dévotion juive privée au 2<sup>e</sup> siècle av. JC<sup>(77)</sup>. Si l'on peut parler d'une harmonisation des données de Gn 46,27 et Ex 1,5 avec celle de Dt 10,22 ainsi que du choix du chiffre 70, on peut également penser que cette harmonisation et ce choix ne sont pas nécessairement liés à la correction de Dt 32,8. La raison d'être de ces deux corrections n'est pas la même. L'harmonisation entre les données de Gn 46,27; Ex 1,5 et Dt 10,22 peut être datée à l'époque hasmonéenne au 2<sup>e</sup> siècle av. JC, alors que la correction de Dt 32,8 peut-être datée au 1<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. JC.

En séparant les deux questions sur le plan historique, on se rend compte que l'harmonisation des chiffres a pu avoir lieu longtemps avant la correction de Dt 32,8. Par contre, on peut effectivement penser que les données déjà harmonisées des chiffres ont facilité la correction des «fils de Dieu» en «fils d'Israël», puisqu'on savait qu'au moment de leur entrée en Egypte ils étaient 70. D'ailleurs cette correction de Dt 32,8 n'est pas sans difficultés parce qu'on voit que les écrits classiques juifs ont dû expliquer à quoi correspond exactement ce chiffre.

(5) *Les retouches textuelles ont continué sous l'hégémonie pharisienne, Dt 32,8 en est un exemple.* Si l'on peut dater la correction de Dt 32,8 à l'époque où il était question de ramener les «fils de Dieu» à la sphère humaine, on peut également constater que les retouches du

(77) Ce verset pourrait être tardif en Dt. Toujours est-il qu'à l'époque hasmonéenne, il prend une importance capitale, puisqu'il voit déjà l'accomplissement des promesses au moins en ce qui concerne le nombre actuel du peuple.

texte biblique ont continué même sous l'hégémonie pharisienne<sup>(78)</sup>. Malgré les affirmations et les apparentes convictions contraires du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle (Flavius Josèphe, Rabbi Aqiba, etc.), je reste convaincu que le texte biblique a quand même été touché<sup>(79)</sup>. Les conceptions théologiques ont primé l'état textuel en certains endroits. C'est le reflet de ce que dit Rabbi Hiyya b. Abba au nom de Rabbi Yoḥanan: «Il vaut mieux qu'une lettre de la Torah soit déracinée plutôt que de profaner publiquement le nom de Dieu», Talmud Babli, Yev 79a. En observant entre autres les changements textuels qui ont eu lieu en Dt 32 d'une manière générale, Tigay constate également: «the sanctity of the text is not so inviolable as to risk misleading people in ways that might compromise monotheism»<sup>(80)</sup>.

Université de Fribourg  
CH-1700 Fribourg

Innocent HIMBAZA

#### SUMMARY

In an article written forty years ago, Dominique Barthélemy bound together two supposed scribal corrections introduced in the second Century BCE: the correction of the number of the Israelites who went down to Egypt (Gen 46,27; Exod 1,5), and the correction of the «Children of God» becoming «Children of Israel» in Deut 32:8. This article proposes to separate the two supposed corrections. Considering the historical evolution of the theological interpretations the author argues that the correction of Deut 32,8 was introduced in the first Century CE only, when the interpretation of the «Children of God» was limited to the human sphere.

<sup>(78)</sup> En 1978, lors de la publication du volume *Etudes d'histoire du texte*, 390, Barthélemy reconnaît qu'il ne serait plus aussi formel sur la cessation des tiqquné sopherim lorsque le texte biblique passa aux mains des pharisiens.

<sup>(79)</sup> Voir G. E. WEIL, *Elie Lévi humaniste et massorète* (1469-1549) (Leiden 1963) 324-328; G. E. WEIL, *Initiation à la Massorah*, L'introduction au ספר זכרון (Leiden 1964) 29-31.

<sup>(80)</sup> TIGAY, *Deuteronomy* דברים, 518.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Pierre ‘fils de la colombe’ en Mt 16,17?

Le dialogue entre Simon Pierre et Jésus, communément appelée la confession de Césarée, est un moment clef de l’Evangile de Matthieu. Son importance dans la structure narrative de Matthieu n’est pas à démontrer. Or il est un détail du texte qui a toujours étonné sans qu’une interprétation réussisse à s’imposer avec conviction: Pourquoi donc Jésus précise-t-il la filiation de Pierre en l’appelant «Pierre, fils de Iona» (Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ)?

Dans le troisième volume de son enquête sur le ‘Jésus historique’, J. P. Meier consacre un chapitre entier au personnage de Simon Pierre et fait le point sur la littérature exégétique le concernant. Il en ressort avec encore plus de force que de coutume l’importance de ce nom nouveau que Jésus a donné à Simon: Pierre. En effet, ce nom devint si vite attaché à la personne de Simon que tous les auteurs du Nouveau Testament l’utilisent abondamment. Seul Jésus semble ne pas utiliser le nom qu’il a lui-même donné<sup>(1)</sup>.

Matthieu lui-même a introduit la personne de Simon en traduisant directement en grec le nom donné par Jésus en araméen: «Simon appelé Pierre» (Mt 4,18: Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον, ce qu’il répète en 10,2, Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενός Πέτρος)<sup>(2)</sup>. Matthieu rappelle ce fait juste avant le verset qui nous occupe en disant «Et Simon Pierre répondit» (Mt 16,16: Σίμων Πέτρος). Matthieu a bien employé le nom jusque là mais sans préciser de qui Simon était le fils. L’appellation «Fils de Jonas» vient donc comme un élément nouveau d’information sur la personne de Simon.

L’Evangile de Jean est témoin de la tradition qui désigne par le nom de ‘Jean’ le père de Simon: «Simon, fils de Jean, tu seras appelé ‘Kéfas’, ce qui signifie Pierre» (Jn 1,42b: Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος). Jean le donne en araméen, ce qui n’est pas le cas de

(1) Cf. sur ce point J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew* (New York 2001) III, 226, qui se refuse, pour d’évidentes raisons, à commenter théologiquement cet étonnement: «Moreover — however paradoxical this may seem — Jesus may have intended that the name *Kēpā*’ be used of Simon only by other people, not by Jesus himself... The name Jesus confers is not the name Jesus uses: what one makes of that paradox is hard to say. One possibility is that Jesus intended the new name *Kēpā*’ to indicate Simon’s relationship to the other disciples, not to Jesus. Once again we must admit that we are left guessing». Il peut être intéressant de relever que Paul utilise presque toujours le nom araméen Κηφᾶς (8 fois), πέτρος ne se trouvant qu’en Ga 2,7.8 et Σίμων jamais.

(2) Le nom ‘Pierre’ traduit le surnom araméen ‘Kéfa’ donné à Simon. ‘Kéfa’ signifie ‘roche’. La pierre avec laquelle on bâtit et le roc sur lequel on construit sont des éléments symboliques bibliques (cf. Nb 20,8-11 [עֲלֵךְ] ou Is 8,14 en lien avec Is 28,16 [יִסְדֵּי]). La ‘roche’ qu’est devenu Simon peut aussi devenir occasion de chute en Mt 16,23 (cf. Is 8,14). La traduction grecque précise de ‘kéfa’ est πέτρα, ‘roche’, mais le mot féminin πέτρα ne convenant pas comme prénom masculin, l’apôtre est appelé πέτρος, ‘pierre’ en grec. La traduction française courante qui met ‘Pierre’ et ‘pierre’ n’est fidèle ni au grec ni à l’araméen mais a l’avantage d’employer deux fois le même mot comme le fait l’araméen, ce qui met en relief le jeu de mots effectué.

Matthieu. Il semble donc bien connaître la figure de Pierre indépendamment de Matthieu.

Pourquoi le nom du père de Simon est-il ici «Jonas» et non «Jean» comme en Jn 21,15.16.17 (Σίμων Ἰωάννου)<sup>(3)</sup>? Notons tout d'abord que la tradition textuelle matthéenne est très sûre. Les meilleurs manuscrits portent Βαρτιωνᾶ en un seul mot tandis qu'un très grand nombre (L Γ <sup>f.13</sup> 33.565.700.892.1241. 1424 *pm*) sépare en deux mots: Βάρ Ἰωνᾶ. Le nom 'Jonas' (Ἰωνᾶς), qui est celui du prophète du même nom, n'est pas inconnu de Matthieu puisqu'il l'utilise en parlant du «signe de Jonas» (Mt 12,39.41; 16,4)<sup>(4)</sup>. Réciproquement l'écart avec Jn 21 était bien perçu puisqu'un grand nombre de manuscrits (notamment l'Alexandrinus ainsi que la tradition syriaque) a changé le 'Jean' en 'Jonas' dans ce dernier cas (A C<sup>2</sup> Θ Ψ <sup>f.13</sup> 33 11 (c) sy Or)<sup>(5)</sup> en écrivant non pas d'ailleurs Σίμων Βαρτιωνᾶ mais Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, en suivant manifestement la construction Σίμων Ἰωάννου de Jn 21.

J.P. Meier présente les hypothèses émises jusqu'à ce jour pour expliquer cet écart et privilégie celle de l'erreur due aux aléas de la transmission orale<sup>(6)</sup>. J'aimerais proposer ici une autre interprétation qui ne prétendra pas

<sup>(3)</sup> Certains manuscrits ont la variante Ἰωνᾶ en Jn 1,42 mais elle est généralement considérée comme secondaire, due à l'influence de Mt 16,17. Cette variante se trouve en A B<sup>2</sup> Ψ <sup>f.13</sup> 11 c q vg<sup>cl</sup> sy bo<sup>ms</sup>; Epiph[ane de Constantinople]. Peu de manuscrits, Θ 1241 *pc* vg, ont une forme courte de 'Jean', Ἰωάννα. Le *textus receptus* est dans 86<sup>75</sup> s B\* C\* L W<sup>s</sup> 33 *pc* it co. Cf. NESTLÉ-ALAND 1993<sup>27</sup>, 250. Les traductions en français seront empruntées à la TOB 1988. Le fait qu'aucun manuscrit n'ait essayé d'harmoniser le terme étrange de Mt avec celui plus compréhensible de Jn est étrange comme le remarque D. HAGNER, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Dallas 1995) II, 469: «Oddly no textual witnesses have harmonized the present passage to agree more closely with the Johannine references».

<sup>(4)</sup> A noter qu'il n'y a aucune différence d'écriture en hébreu entre le nom du prophète Jonas et la colombe.

<sup>(5)</sup> Cf. NESTLÉ-ALAND 1993<sup>27</sup>, 318-319. Les changements sont effectués pour les trois versets de Jn 21. Sauf Origène qui est indiqué en sus seulement pour le v. 17, le dernier. Le texte retenu est appuyé par s<sup>1</sup> B C\* D L W l 844 lat co, pour le v. 15, par s B C\* D W lat co, pour le v. 16 et par P<sup>90id</sup> s B C\* D L W lat co, pour le v. 17. Le fait que l'orthographe de 'Jean' varie beaucoup et que dans la LXX elle-même on rencontre des abréviations variées est certes un argument pour lire Ἰωνᾶ comme une simple abréviation de Ἰωάννου. C'est aussi l'interprétation à laquelle semble se rallier un récent commentaire: «Gesù chiama l'apostolo con il nome proprio Simone e con il patronimico *bar-iona*, che compare solo qui in tutto il NT; Infatti secondo Gv 1,42; 21,15.17 il nome del padre di Pietro è Giovanni. Questo implica che uno dei due è errato oppure che questo Ἰωνᾶ [sic] è abbreviazione di *Jo—anan*—Giovanni, cosa che stando a Dalman e Billerbeck (I, 370), non è positivamente sostenuta da alcun documento. Jeremias... la ritiene tuttavia ancora la più probabile spiegazione [J. JEREMIAS, 'Ἰωνᾶς', ThWNT III, 410]» (C. MARUCCI, «Simon Pietro e la Chiesa di Cristo: Mt 16,17-19», *Credo Ecclesiam* [ed. E. CATTANEO – A. TERRACINO] [Napoli 2000] 93-130), 106. Cet article contient une bibliographie conséquente sur ces versets.

<sup>(6)</sup> Cf. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, 275, n. 89. Voilà comment il présente son opinion: «In my view, the most likely explanation of the difference is that the original name of Peter's father, whether it was Jonah (*yōnā*) or John (*yōhānān*), was inadvertently garbled in the decades-long oral tradition of either the Matthean or the Johannine community. Such garbling is not a merely theoretical possibility: LXX manuscripts at times interchange the two names (see, e.g., LXX 1 Chr 26:3). There is no way of knowing which form of the name is historically correct, although the rarity of Jonah as a proper name around the turn of the era might argue that the original name was John and that it was changed by Matthew (or his special tradition) to Jonah for theological purposes (e.g. the sign of Jonah in Matt 12:39 and 16:4; Peter's role as a true prophet; or the initial unwillingness of both Peter and Jonah to go to the Gentiles [Jonah 1:1-3; Acts 10]; see Joachim Jeremias, '*Jonas*,' *TDNT* 3 (1965) 406-10 ». Si le terme était en Lc-Ac, on pourrait peut-être faire cette hypothèse mais

à un statut autre que celui d'hypothèse mais qui s'insère bien tant dans le contexte immédiat que dans celui plus large de l'évangile de Matthieu.

Notons tout d'abord qu'il est étrange de souligner aussi fortement la filiation charnelle de Simon Pierre au moment même où c'est le Père qui parle en lui et non «la *chair* et le *sang*» (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα), expression hébraïque qui met précisément en valeur la descendance charnelle<sup>(7)</sup>. Cela pourrait être bien sûr une façon stylistique de renforcer le contraste: 'Tu es bien le 'fils de Jonas' mais là c'est un autre qui parle en toi et ce que tu dis nul ne peut te l'avoir appris'. Cette lecture met bien en valeur un double contraste entre «Simon, fils de Jonas» et «le Christ, le Fils de Dieu» qu'il confesse<sup>(8)</sup>. Mais ne pourrait-on pas envisager une autre hypothèse, à savoir que Jésus effectue ici un jeu de mots théologiquement signifiant?

En effet, '*Iona*' signifie, en hébreu comme en araméen, la colombe, qui est dans les Evangiles un symbole de l'Esprit Saint<sup>(9)</sup>. Ce symbole est

---

dans le cadre de Matthieu, cela paraît hautement invraisemblable. Il poursuit: «Other — and in my opinion, less likely — theories include the following: (1) Peter had been a Zealot; bar-Jonah derives from an Akkadian word for 'terrorist'. (2) The tradition of the Johannine community changed the original name Jonah (not commonly used at the time) to the more common and popular John. (3) The change was inadvertent and was caused by the common occurrence of the name John at the time». Deux éléments sont ici dignes d'être relevés: Premièrement le nom 'Jonas' était très rare et on ne voit pas pourquoi la tradition orale l'aurait remplacé par le commun 'Jean'. Deuxièmement le contexte n'a aucun rapport avec celui du signe du prophète Jonas, seule autre occurrence du mot chez Matthieu. Si la forme était une abréviation rare de Jean (opinion de U. LUZ, *Matthew 8–20* [Augsburg 2001]), on pourrait penser que des manuscrits de Matthieu auraient corrigé et réintroduit Ἰωάννου, notant la confusion possible avec le terme ἰωνά employé ailleurs (Mt 12,39; 16,4).

(7) Je pense donc que la TOB ne saisit pas exactement la nuance de ce verset lorsqu'elle commente ainsi cette expression: «'La *chair* et le *sang*': même expression sémitique en 1 Co 15,50 et Ga 1,16 pour désigner l'homme tout entier comme être faible et incapable», TOB 1988, 1455, n. y. Ce n'est pas tant la faiblesse humaine que Jésus souligne ici que la filiation humaine et la suite des engendremens qu'elle implique. Il s'agit de souligner le caractère spécifique et nouveau de la seconde naissance (cf. Jn 1,42 en lien avec Jn 3,3-6) plutôt que de déprécier la première. Le fait que Simon soit appelé par son nouveau nom en Mt 16,18 et le contexte de confession de la foi font penser au baptême qui est pour le chrétien une seconde naissance. Il en va de même en Ga 1,16 où l'expression intervient également dans le cadre d'une 'révélation' de la filiation de Jésus Christ. Ce rapprochement a conduit certains exégètes à assumer un lien entre Galates et Matthieu sur ce point mais le parallèle s'explique plutôt par leur commun enracinement biblique selon J. DUPONT, «La révélation du Fils de Dieu en faveur de Pierre (Mt 16,17) et de Paul (Ga 1,16)», *RSR* 52 (1964) 411-420. Pour le lien entre chair et la filiation, cf. aussi D. BOYARIN, *A Radical Jew. Paul and the Politics of Cultural Identity* (Berkeley 1994) 77: «Σὰρξ, בשר, ... in Jewish parlance... refers... to the physical connection of genealogy of filiation and of family relationship», qui renvoie à Rm 9,3 ou 11,14.

(8) Telle est la lecture de St Jean Chrysostome: «All but saying, 'as you art son of Jonas, even so am I son of My Father'. Else it were superfluous to say, *Thou art Son of Jonas*; But since he had said, *Son of God*, to point out that he is so Son of God, as the other son of Jonas, of the same substance with Him that begat Him, therefore He added this» in *Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St Matthew* (Oxford 1844) 730-731 (sans indication du traducteur; souligné par lui).

(9) L'origine de ce lien est incertain. Il s'enracine probablement dans un parallèle entre Gn 1,2 et Gn 8,9. Dans le premier cas, c'est l'Esprit du Seigneur qui planait sur les eaux, dans le second c'est la colombe. Le rapprochement aurait pu être justifié au moyen de la méthode de la *gezerah shawah* (selon sa forme pré-rabbinique). En effet, les termes 'à la surface' (עַל־הַמַּיִם) et 'les eaux' - (מַיִם) se rencontrent en ces deux endroits. Il faut noter surtout que le verbe rare 'planer' (חָנַן; Gn 1,2) fait penser à un oiseau et ne se retrouve qu'en Dt

important pour les Évangélistes (cf. Mc 1,10; Lc 3,22 et Jn 1,32) et Matthieu affirme que Jésus a vu l'Esprit descendre sous forme d'une colombe lors de son baptême: «Les cieux s'ouvrirent et il vit l'Esprit de Dieu descendre comme une *colombe* et venir sur lui. Et voici qu'une voix venant des cieux disait: 'Celui-ci est mon *fils* bien aimé, celui qu'il m'a plu de choisir'» (Mt 3,16b-17). Ce que Jésus reçoit et ce qui est révélé à lui (et aux autres présents à la scène selon les Évangélistes) au moment du baptême, c'est justement la marque de sa filiation divine. C'est l'Esprit Saint qui permet de reconnaître en Jésus le fils du Père. Or c'est bien cette confession que, pour la première fois depuis le baptême de Jésus, Simon Pierre effectue en Mt 16,16: «Tu es le Christ, le Fils du Dieu vivant».

En outre l'expression '*bar* + un nom' peut avoir un sens métaphorique en hébreu comme en araméen. Les fils de la lumière et les fils des ténèbres sont ceux qui agissent selon le principe de la lumière ou selon celui de l'obscurité. En témoignent tant les Évangiles (cf. Lc 16,8 et en Matthieu, Mt 8,12 et 13,38, 'les fils du Royaume') que les textes de Qumran.

Ajoutons également que Jean rejoint également Matthieu et les synoptiques sur ce point puisqu'il emploie une expression très voisine pour parler de ceux qui ont reconnu Jésus comme *logos* (Jn 1,1) et fils de Dieu: «Ceux-là ne sont pas nés des *sangs*, ni d'un vouloir de *chair* (οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός) ni d'un vouloir d'homme mais de Dieu» (Jn 1,13). En effet, «à ceux qui l'ont reçu, à ceux qui croient en son nom, il a donné le pouvoir de devenir enfants (τέκνα) de Dieu» (Jn 1,12). Dans Jean, c'est le Baptiste qui déclare: «J'ai vu l'Esprit, tel une colombe, descendre du

---

32, 11 où Dieu est comparé à un aigle (l'aigle est néanmoins généralement un symbole négatif dans la littérature intertestamentaire sauf LAB 48,1 et *Paralipomènes de Jer.* 7,2-3,18). Le rapprochement entre Dt 32 et Gn 1 est explicite dans le TY *Haguiga* II.1 à propos de Gn 1,2: «Ben Zoma said... It is said 'hovering' and it is said there 'as an eagle... hovers its young' (Deut 32:11)» in J. NEUSNER, *Talmud Yerushalmi* (Chicago 1986) 44. La mention explicite de la colombe se trouve en TB *Haguiga* 15a: «'Et l'Esprit du Seigneur planait sur les eaux', tel une *colombe qui plane* [כַּיֶּהוּדָה שְׂמֵרָחָה עַל בְּיָה] par dessus ses petits, mais sans les toucher» (*Traité Haguiga*, Paris 1991, 115). Cf. aussi GenR II, 4. La colombe en lien avec l'Esprit se retrouve à la Mer Rouge dans la *Mekhilta de R. Ishmaël* sur Ex 14,13 et 15,2. Un parallèle entre l'Esprit et un oiseau, la tourterelle de Ct 2,12, se trouve aussi dans le targum sur le Cantique: «The voice of the turtle dove... the voice of the *Spirit* of Salvation which I spoke unto Abraham», in H. GOLLANCZ, *The Targum to the 'Song of Songs'*... (London 1908) 36. Dans la littérature rabbinique, (en raison de Ct 6,14, Ps 68,14 et Os 7,11) la colombe désigne fréquemment Israël (cf. b. Shab 130a; b. Git 45a: «La colombe est le symbole d'Israël». Cf. aussi So 3,1 (LXX), LAB 21,6; 23,7 [Abraham]; 39,5; 4 Es 5,26). Pour un lien entre la Voix céleste et la colombe, cf. b. Ber 3a (hébreu édition Soncino 1960): «J'ai entendu une voix céleste, semblable à la plainte d'une colombe [בְּתָה קוֹל שְׂמֵרָחָה כִּינֹה יְהוֹמֵר], et qui disait: 'Malheur à [ceux de mes] enfants...'» in *Aggadah du Talmud de Babylone* (trad. A. ELKAÏM-SARTRE) (Paris 1982) 37. Cf. GOLLANCZ, *The Targum*, 37, où Ct 2,14 est ainsi commenté: «And the Bath Kol proceeded from heaven and proclaimed: 'O thou Assembly of Israel resembling the neat dove...' ». Deux phénomènes semblent ainsi s'être conjugués: D'une part, le verbe de Gn 1,2 incite à comparer l'Esprit à un oiseau et d'autre part, l'oiseau pur le plus valorisé dans la Bible est la colombe, et ce dès Gn 8,9. Il est question des deux petits de la colombe dans les sacrifices comme en Lv 5,7; 5,11; 12,8; 14,22; 15,14; 15,29; Nb 6,10, toujours avec le terme νεοσσός 'petits'. En Lv 12,6 cependant se trouve l'expression au singulier, 'fils de la colombe', בְּנוֹתָהּ (νεοσσόν περίστεράς LXX), hapax en hébreu comme en grec.



ciel et demeurer sur lui... Et moi j'ai vu et j'atteste qu'il est, lui, le Fils de Dieu» (Jn 1,32b.34).

Ainsi le Jésus matthéen pourrait faire un jeu de mots entre le nom Jonas et la colombe<sup>(10)</sup>: Il dirait en substance à Simon: 'Heureux es-tu Simon, fils de [la] Colombe (= 'fils de l'Esprit Saint') car ce ne sont pas la chair et le sang (= 'ton père' charnel, que celui-ci s'appelle Jean ou non) qui t'ont révélé que je suis le *Fils* mais mon *Père* qui est aux cieux (qui est maintenant aussi le tien dans l'Esprit Saint, cf. Jn 1,12; Jn 20,17; Ga 4,6; Rm 8,15)'.

Même s'il semble impossible de démontrer cette hypothèse, il est sûr que le mot *Iona* ne pouvait pas ne pas éveiller des échos chez les auditeurs de langue araméenne qui entendait l'Evangile de Matthieu<sup>(11)</sup>. Le jeu de mots reposant sur une compétence linguistique qui s'est peu à peu perdue et étant limité à une seule occurrence, il n'est pas étonnant qu'il ait été oublié. J. P. Meier fait remarquer qu'il en va de même avec le seul autre 'surnom', ou nouveau nom, donné solidairement par Jésus aux fils de Zébédée, *Boanerges* soit les 'fils du tonnerre' (βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς) selon Mc 3,17. On ne sait plus exactement ce que cette expression veut dire et ce fait même entraîne les commentateurs à penser que c'était un 'surnom', c'est-à-dire non pas un nouveau nom solennellement conféré, mais un surnom humoristique, peut-être basé sur un jeu de mots lié par exemple au caractère des deux frères<sup>(12)</sup>. Si jeu de mots il y a donc en Mt 16,17, il a le mérite de souligner combien c'est l'Esprit Saint qui permet à Simon Pierre de faire cette confession de la filiation divine du Fils.

Il y a donc réciprocité entre la confession du Père et celle du Fils puisque «c'est l'Esprit du *Fils* qui crie en nous 'Abba *Père*'» (Ga 4,6). De même que l'Esprit Saint révèle le Père, il révèle aussi le Fils. Cette théologie interprète la parole de Jésus: «Nul ne connaît le *Fils* si ce n'est le *Père*, et nul ne connaît le *Père* si ce n'est le *Fils*, et celui à qui le *Fils* veut bien le révéler» (Mt

<sup>(10)</sup> Si le nom du père de Simon était Jean, il le ferait entre Jean et Jonas. Les deux noms sont différents en hébreu, comme nous l'avons vu, et en araméen (phonétiquement '*yaono*' et '*yūhanon*'). Même s'il y a une vague ressemblance, les deux noms sont néanmoins très clairement différents. En outre, l'un est un nom extrêmement rare, l'autre en revanche très courant. Il est vrai que la LXX varie parfois dans sa translittération de 'Jean'. (Ἰωάννας en 1 Ch 5,36 et Ἰωάναν en 2 R 25,23, dans les deux cas au nominatif). Ajoutons que la recension de Lucianus met plusieurs fois Ἰωναν au lieu de Ἰωάναν. Cf. la concordance HATCH/REDPATH, Supplément, 91.

<sup>(11)</sup> Nous nous heurtons ici à une objection réelle. En hébreu comme en araméen, l'Esprit est généralement du genre féminin, ce qui pourrait poser un problème en Mt 16,17. De fait, des deux constructions possibles pour exprimer l'attribution, l'état construit (*bar* + nom) et l'état absolu avec un suffixe possessif suivi d'un relatif (*bro* + suffixe + nom), la version syriaque de la *Peshitta* privilégie en Mt 16,17 la seconde, c'est-à-dire, 'le fils, de lui, Jonas' (*Breh de Yaono*). Elle souligne ainsi la masculinité du père, alors qu'en Jn 21, elle utilise la première forme (*bar*) et modifie la première voyelle du nom qui s'allonge et devient '*Yōano*'. Cela semblerait indiquer que l'allusion à l'Esprit Saint soit était inconnue du traducteur syriaque, soit a été volontairement écartée. Néanmoins l'esprit peut être de genre masculin tant en hébreu (une trentaine de cas dans le TM) qu'en araméen.

<sup>(12)</sup> Cf. la discussion dans MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, III, 214-215.220, où il privilégie, *in fine* et avec précaution, non pas un surnom psychologique mais un nouveau nom lié à leur mission: «Possibly Jesus called the brothers 'sons of thunder' because he realized or wished to foster their potential as thundering witnesses for his proclamation of the kingdom», 220. Il suit A. CULPEPPER, *John the son of Zebedee. The Life of a Legend* (Columbia 1994).

11,27b), en soulignant le rôle de l'Esprit Saint. De même que la révélation du Fils par la voix céleste en Mt 3,16 était rendue possible grâce à l'Esprit sous forme de colombe, c'est dans l'Esprit Saint que Jésus loue le Père en Lc 10,21-22 (dans le parallèle lucanien à Mt 11,25-27). En Mt 16,17, Matthieu complète la périchorèse: C'est le Père qui révèle le Fils 'à celui à qui [il] veut bien le révéler', Simon Pierre, grâce à la colombe, à l'Esprit Saint. Grâce à l'Esprit envoyé par le Père, Simon est rendu capable de confesser ce que la voix avait révélé en Mt 3,16.

\*  
\* \*

Résumons les cinq éléments qui peuvent être invoqués en faveur de cette hypothèse <sup>(13)</sup>:

(1) Elle ne suppose pas une erreur dans la tradition orale ou une faute de copiste mais suppose l'existence d'un jeu de mots effectué délibérément, soit par Jésus lui-même, soit par la tradition araméenne reprise par le Jésus mathéen.

(2) Elle a le mérite de la simplicité en ce qu'elle ne suppose aucune référence au prophète Jonas. Elle ne fait pas appel à un autre 'Jonas', nom particulièrement rare à l'époque comme le relève J. P. Meier, et ne s'oppose pas à ce que le nom du père de Simon ait pu être 'Jean'.

<sup>(13)</sup> Cette hypothèse n'est pas nouvelle (comme souvent en exégèse!), même si elle n'est presque jamais mentionnée dans les commentaires contemporains. Elle apparaît dans le commentaire sur Matthieu de St Jérôme: «Donc sa profession de foi lui vaut un nom qui indique qu'il reçoit sa révélation du Saint-Esprit, dont il doit aussi être appelé le fils. De fait *Barjona* signifie dans notre langue 'le fils de la colombe' [L'éditeur renvoie au *De Interp. Hebr. Nom.*, 60,22 (éd. Lagarde)] . D'autres comprennent tout simplement que Simon, c'est-à-dire Pierre, est fils de Jean, d'après une question posée dans un autre passage: 'Simon, fils de Jean, m'aimes-tu?' [Jn 21,15]... Ils prétendent qu'il y a faute des copistes: au lieu de 'Bar Johanna', c'est à dire fils de Jean, omettant une syllabe, ils auraient écrit Bar Jona... Quant à ces paroles: 'Parce que ce n'est pas la chair et le sang qui te l'ont révélé', compare-les au récit de l'Apôtre où il dit: 'Aussitôt je n'ai point pris conseil de la chair et du sang'. 'La chair et le sang'» (traduction E. Bonnard). Cf. JÉRÔME, *Commentaire sur St Matthieu* (SC 259; Paris 1979) II, 15. Le développement théologique le plus complet se trouve chez Bède le Vénérable: «'Beato te Simone figlio di Giona'. Il siriano Bar Iona in latino significa figlio della colomba. A ragione l'apostolo è detto figlio della colomba, perchè la colomba è un animale molto semplice... O anche perchè lo Spirito Santo era disceso sotto forma di colomba, per questo viene chiamato figlio della colomba egli che fu pieno di grazia spirituale. E con giusta lode il Signore ricompensa quello che lo amava e ne professava la dignità, chiamandolo figlio dello Spirito Santo, quello del quale egli stesso era stato proclamato Figlio del Dio vero... Pietro è diventato figlio dello Spirito Santo dal momento in cui, illuminato da quello, ha ricevuto la conoscenza di Dio. E poiché una sola è la volontà l'operazione della santa Trinità, dopo aver detto: 'Beato sei tu Simone figlio di Giona', cioè figlio della grazia spirituale, subito il Signore aggiunse: 'Poiché né la carne né il sangue ti ha rivelato questo ma il Padre mio che è nei cieli'. Il Padre infatti ha rivelato al figlio della colomba che una sola è la grazia del Padre, dello Spirito Santo e anche del Figlio... Dice infatti del Padre l'apostolo: 'Dio ha mandato lo Spirito di suo Figlio nei nostri cuori' [Ga 4,6]. Dello Spirito Santo proprio il Figlio dice: 'Quando verrà il Paraclito che io vi manderò dal padre' [Jn 15,26]. Dello Spirito Santo l'apostolo dice: 'Tutte queste cose lo compia un solo e medesimo Spirito, distribuendole a ciascuno come vuole' [1 Co 12,11]. Il Padre dunque manda lo Spirito, il Figlio manda lo Spirito e 'lo Spirito soffia dove vuole' [Jn 3,8]... Perciò viene detto che il Padre che è nei cieli ha rivelato al figlio della colomba il mistero della fede, che la carne e il sangue non gli potevano rivelare» in Venerabile BEDA, *Omellie sul Vangelo* (Collana di testi patristici 3; Roma 1990) I, 20, 216-218.

(3) Elle suppose chez Jésus une parole inventive qui n'hésite pas à faire des jeux de mots<sup>(14)</sup> et à désigner des personnes par des composés de 'fils de + un nom', procédé qui était commun à l'époque et dont l'Évangile lui-même garde des traces (cf. Mt 8,12 et Mc 3,17).

(4) Elle s'appuie sur une compétence linguistique commune tant en hébreu qu'en araméen et garde le mot tel qu'il nous est transmis dans la tradition manuscrite.

(5) Elle s'harmonise bien tant avec la logique narrative et théologique de Matthieu qu'avec d'autres passages des Évangiles (Lc 10,22) et des lettres pauliniennes (Ga 4,6; Rm 8,15).

Cette proposition expliquerait le maintien de cet étrange 'fils de Jonas' en Mt 16,17 ainsi que le fait que les harmonisations se soient orientées plutôt vers une modification de Jn 21. Sans être pour rien au monde exégétiquement certaine, cette suggestion se révèle au moins théologiquement recevable dans le cadre narratif matthéen. Plus que celle d'une confusion due aux trous de la tradition orale comme le suggère *in fine* J. P. Meier, ou que celle d'une abréviation originale du nom Jean, cette hypothèse d'un jeu de mots de Jésus, ou tout du moins du Jésus matthéen, s'accorde remarquablement avec l'ensemble du récit matthéen ainsi qu'avec sa théologie.

15, rue Monsieur  
75007 Paris

Marc RASTOIN

#### SUMMARY

This note intends to shed some light on the *bar iona* expression used in Matt 16,17. Even if the textual critique is almost unanimous, modern interpreters usually take it as a misspelling for 'son of John', or confess their perplexity. The semitic meaning of *iona* could help to rehabilitate an old Patristic reading, seeing a link between the dove (*iona* in hebrew and aramaic) and the Holy Spirit. This pun of the Matthean Jesus not only fits well in the immediate context but also agrees with the overall matthean theology.

<sup>(14)</sup> Il serait possible d'arguer du jeu de mots sur 'pierre', qui suit immédiatement en Mt 16,18, pour estimer que deux jeux de mots si rapprochés sont peu vraisemblables. D'un autre côté, ils ne sont pas contradictoires. Au contraire, c'est peut-être parce qu'il a accueilli l'Esprit Saint que Simon peut être qualifié de 'roc'.

## The View of Jerusalem in the Ethnographical Introduction of Chronicles (1 Chr 1–9)

The ethnographical introduction of the book of Chronicles (1 Chr 1–9) comprises a collection of various genealogical and geographical lists as well as some historical notes regarding a range of issues. Essentially, Jerusalem is mentioned in three texts of this part: in the list of David's descendants (1 Chr 3, esp. verses 4–5), in the genealogy of the Levites (1 Chr 5,27–6,66 [ET: 6,1–81]), and in the closing chapter (1 Chr 9,2–34). The aim of this article is to draw up the representation of Jerusalem in these texts, their presumed contexts, meanings and significance in the Chronistic writing.

### I. David's Descendants and Dynasty

The book of Chronicles opens with a chapter dedicated to all nations (1 Chr 1), while the following seven chapters deal with Israel only (1 Chr 2–8). The tribes of Judah (1 Chr 2–4)<sup>(1)</sup> — the core of the Southern Kingdom and later on the Chronicler's own community — take up more than 46% of the entire Israelites' genealogy. In the center of Judah's genealogies appear David, his descendants, and dynasty as well as the royal line in the exilic and post-exilic times until Anani (1 Chr 3)<sup>(2)</sup>.

For the first time in the Chronistic historical writing, Jerusalem is mentioned in the heart of Judah's genealogical lists. The Chronicler accounts for David's sons (1 Chr 3,1–9) while basing his information on four texts from the book of Samuel (2 Sam 3,2–5; 5,5; 5,14–16; and 13,1). He is making a clear distinction between those sons who were born in Hebron (1 Chr 3,1–4a // 2 Sam 3,2–5) and those born in Jerusalem (1 Chr 3,5–9 // 2 Sam 5,14–16). As a point of contrast between the lists he uses David's reign in these cities: seven years and six months in Hebron, thirty-three years in Jerusalem (1 Chr 3,4b // 2 Sam 5,5)<sup>(3)</sup>. Nevertheless, from among the six sons who were born

<sup>(1)</sup> These lists include the tribe of Simeon (1 Chr 4,24–43), whose territory was within that of Judah (Josh 19,1), as well as other tribal elements such as the clans of the Kenites and Kenizzites (1 Chr 2,55; 4,13–15), who all were assimilated into the tribe of Judah during the monarchic era, see I. KALIMI, "Three Assumptions About the Kenites", ZAW 100 (1988) 386–393.

<sup>(2)</sup> This chapter (as well as 4,1–23) is not a "late supplement to chapter 2" as suggested by W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen 1955) 1, 11, 26. See also below, and note 9. It may be noteworthy that like David who is located in the *seventh* place of Jesse's sons (1 Chr 2,13–15), Anani — the last descendant of David mentioned in Chronicles — is also located in the *seventh* place (1 Chr 3,24). Since the placing of David in the seventh place shows the Chronicler's positive attitude towards him, probably the placing of Anani — presumably the Chronicler's contemporary figure (see references in note 8) — may indicate the same attitude. See I. KALIMI, "A Transmission of Tradition: The Number of Jesse's Sons - Biblical Writings, Judeo-Hellenistic Arts, Rabbinic Literature and Medieval Christian Art", TZ 57 (2001) 1–9.

<sup>(3)</sup> See in detail I. KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*. Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltexten in den Samuel- und

in Hebron, no one had been chosen to inherit David's throne. Solomon, who was born in Jerusalem, had been chosen to be king over all Israel.

Though according to the book of Samuel, Solomon was the only surviving son of David's beloved wife, Bath-Sheba, while the first one died shortly after his birth (2 Sam 12,13b-25), the Chronicler invented, most probably, a list of four sons born to her<sup>(4)</sup>, all of them in Jerusalem. The list is formed according to the literary-numerical pattern of 'three-four', and Solomon is located in the final — and therefore also the essential — place. It means, that the three older sons of Bath-Sheba are disqualified for kingship, while Solomon, the fourth one and the youngest, is chosen to be king of Israel<sup>(5)</sup>, and accordingly also to build the House of the Lord in Jerusalem (1 Chr 22,9-11; 28,4-7)<sup>(6)</sup>. Thus, the Chronicler glorifies Solomon as the one who was born in the proper place and was the best among all his brethren.

The Chronicler introduces the fact that the whole Davidic dynasty was established in Jerusalem, that is, Solomon of the united kingdom of Judah and Israel as well as twenty kings of Judah had the privilege to be born in the God's chosen Temple city, to reign and be buried in it (1 Chr 3,10-18). Moreover, Jerusalem housed the Davidic descendants not only in the whole monarchic period but also in the post-exilic period (1 Chr 3,19-24)<sup>(7)</sup>. In other words, the Chronicler describes Jerusalem as the place David's sons lived in, almost uninterruptedly, since the capture of the city by David until, presumably, the Chronicler's own time in the Persian period<sup>(8)</sup>.

The Chronicler listed David's sons twice in his book: once here in chapter 3, and another time in the original context of the list in 1 Chr 14,4-7 that

---

Königsbüchern (BZAW 226; Berlin – New York 1995) 266-268, and also 194-195, 221-222; IDEM, *The Book of Chronicles*. Historical Writing and Literary Devices (The Biblical Encyclopaedia Library XVIII; Jerusalem 2000) 299-301, 215-216, 247-248 (Hebrew). In both periods and places he reigned over *all* the Israelite tribes (1 Chr 3,4b compare *ibid.* 29,27), in contrast to the information in the parallel earlier texts (2 Sam 5,5b; 1 Kgs 2,11), see KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 20-21, 89-90; IDEM, *Chronicles*, 23-26, 97-98.

<sup>(4)</sup> Here she is named "Bath-Shu'a" (a variation arising from a phonetically interchanged letters of b and w), and her father is called "Am'mi-el", while in 2 Sam 11,3 he is named "Eliam" (that is, the two letters of the name reversed, either in Chronicles or in Samuel).

<sup>(5)</sup> On this issue see in detail KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 305-307; IDEM, *Chronicles*, 345-347.

<sup>(6)</sup> Cf. 1 Kgs 5,17-19.

<sup>(7)</sup> Excluding, of course, Jechoniah's / Jehoiachin's sons and grandsons who were born in his exile, in Babylon (1 Chr 3,17-19). Jechoniah's seven sons are mentioned in 1 Chr 3,17-18 and by the Babylonian Chronicles, which mentions five sons only, see J.B. PRITCHARD (ed.), *ANET*, 308. Is the difference of the numbers is "perhaps the final two were born at a later date" (R. BRAUN, *1 Chronicles* [WBC 14; Waco, TX 1986], 52), or perhaps due to number "seven" that the Chronicler constructed. Similarly, he listed "seven" sons for Jesse in contrast to "four / eight" sons in the book of Samuel. He also created "four" sons for Bath-Sheba in contrast to only one son that we know from Samuel.

<sup>(8)</sup> On issue see in detail, I. KALIMI, "Die Abfassungszeit der Chronik - Forschungsstand und Perspektiven", *ZAW* 105 (1993) 223-233; IDEM, "Könnte die aramäische Grabinschrift aus Ägypten als Indikation für die Datierung der Chronikbücher fungieren?", *ZAW* 110 (1998) 79-81; "The Date of Chronicles: The Biblical Text, the Elephantine Papyri and the El-Ibrahimia's Aramaic Grave Inscription", *Hebrew Bible and Related Literature*. S.J. Devries Commemorative Volume (eds. J.H. ELLENS – I. KALIMI – R.P. KNIERIM) (JSOTSS; Sheffield 2003).

follows the parallel text of 2 Sam 5,11-16 (David's house, wives and children in Jerusalem)<sup>(9)</sup>. Indeed, the listing of David's sons in chapter 3 strengthens Judah's genealogy in the direction of David and his descendants<sup>(10)</sup>. It seems, however, that the Chronicler's main purpose was to depict Jerusalem as an ultimate and almost uninterrupted residence city of David's descendants<sup>(11)</sup>.

The Chronicler may be attempting to encourage contemporary citizens of *Jehud Madinta* to move to Jerusalem and live in the city continually, while showing that the Davidic descendants were and actually are almost always in the city since its conquest. Let us not forget that just several years earlier, Nehemiah forced some provincial Jews to take residence in the depopulated city of Jerusalem (see below, section 3).

## II. Levi's Genealogy

Following the tribes of Judah, the widest space in this part of the book of Chronicles is given to the line of Levi (1 Chr 5,27-6,66 [6,1-81]). Obviously, it is due to the special attention that the Chronicler provides to these tribes among all the Israelites, and their specific role in the nation's history.

Within the lists of Levi, specific sections are taken up with the lineage of the high priests (1 Chr 5,28-41 [6,2-15]) and the priestly and Levitical cities (1 Chr 6,39-66 [6,54-81]). Jerusalem is mentioned here three times - all in historical notes concerning the Solomonic Temple cult; two are related to the First Temple's high priests Azariah who served in "the House which *Solomon built in Jerusalem*" (5,36 [6,10]) at the opening of that era; and Jehozadak, "who went into exile when the Lord sent Judah and Jerusalem into exile by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar" (5,41 [6,15]) at the close of the era. The last reference to the city regards the Levites as cult-singers. According to the Chronicler, David appointed the cult-singers to supervise the musical service in "the Tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting" which he erected in Jerusalem after moving the ark of Covenant from Kiriath Jearim<sup>(12)</sup>. Later on, the singers served in "the House of the Lord, which *Solomon built in Jerusalem*" (6,16-17 [6,31-32]).

<sup>(9)</sup> On the differences between the two lists in Chronicles itself as well as between these both and the one in 2 Sam 5, see BRAUN, *1 Chronicles*, 50.

<sup>(10)</sup> See P.[C.] BEENTJES, "Jerusalem in the Book of Chronicles", *The Centrality of Jerusalem. Historical Perspectives* (eds. M. POORTHUIS – Ch. SAFRAI) (Kampen 1996) 19 (and the earlier bibliographical references which were listed there in note 28).

<sup>(11)</sup> Contra RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, 26 who defined the list in 1 Chr 3 as late addition. There are several examples for the double usage of a text from Samuel-Kings by the Chronicler, for example: 2 Chr 1,14-16 and 9,25-28 (// 1 Kgs 10,26-28); 2 Chr 2,1 and 2,16-17 (// 1 Kgs 5,29-30). These and other cases, however, are included in the literary category of *inclusio* (see KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 249-273; IDEM, *Chronicles*, 279-308), which is not the case in 1 Chr 3, and 14,4-7.

<sup>(12)</sup> See 1 Chr 15,1; 16,1.7 (verse 1 is parallel to 2 Sam 6,17); 17,2.5 // 2 Sam 7,2.6; 2 Chr 1,3. See also 1 Chr 16,4-7. This religious institution - the musical service in "the Tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting" - was actually created by the Chronicler himself, and has no basis in any other Biblical sources. According to him, the cultic activity, however, took place in Gibeon, see 1 Chr 16,39-42; 21,29; 2 Chr 1,3-6. For the historical credibility of this information in the book of Chronicles, see KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 129-134; idem, *Chronicles*, 142-146.

These notes (which are not necessary in the genealogical lists) emphasize, first and foremost, the importance of Jerusalem's Temple in the eyes of the author. The notes stress also the Chronicler's special attitude towards the Temple builder, Solomon (subjects that are well stated in the narrative section of his writing). Nevertheless, since the fact that King Solomon built the Temple in *Jerusalem* is a well-known case, it is unnecessary to mention it repeatedly (5,36; 6,17). The Chronicler chose to do so twice in a short paragraph, probably on purpose in order to highlight the holiness as well as the significance of his own small town of Jerusalem. As already stated above concerning 1 Chr 3, it should be kept in mind once again that just shortly prior to the Chronicler's time, Nehemiah made extraordinary efforts to re-populate Jerusalem (see below, the next section).

### III. The Inhabitants of Jerusalem

The Chronicler deals with Jerusalem also in the last chapter of this part of his work (1 Chr 9) regarding the families who moved to the town. The first section of the list (verses 2-17) is a parallel to Neh 11,3-19. Though there are several differences between the texts<sup>(13)</sup>, they are not two versions of a common *Vorlage* (J. Goettsberger)<sup>(14)</sup>, nor are the texts based on two different, independent, archival sources (M. Noth, H. Schneider, J.M. Meyers)<sup>(15)</sup>, nor are they "various genealogical lists... present in the archives; each author made use of it in his own way" (F.C. Fensham)<sup>(16)</sup>. It is also not the case that the author of the list in Nehemiah took it from Chronicles as assumed by G. Hölscher<sup>(17)</sup>. By contrast, it seems that the list in Chronicles depends on Nehemiah<sup>(18)</sup>, and on an additional list (verses 18-34), which has no parallel to any other known source<sup>(19)</sup>.

<sup>(13)</sup> Thus, one can not speak about "die gleiche Liste" as stated by H. BÜCKERS, *Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon* (HBK IV 1; Freiburg im Br. 1952) 71.

<sup>(14)</sup> See J. GOETTSBERGER, *Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon* (HSAT 4,1; Bonn 1939) 88-89. Williamson states somewhat differently (without referring to Goettsberger): "have drawn independently on a common source"; see H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Ezra - Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, TX 1985) 348.

<sup>(15)</sup> M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Tübingen 1957) 130-131; H. SCHNEIDER, *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia* (HSAT 4,2; Bonn 1959) 42-43, 231; J.M. MEYERS, *Ezra - Nehemiah* (AB; Garden City, NY 1965) 185-186.

<sup>(16)</sup> F.C. FENSHAM, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1982) 244.

<sup>(17)</sup> "Als Vorlage diente die Liste 1 Chr 9,2ff., an deren Wortlaut der Verfasser sich anlehnt, aber mit großer Freiheit variierend, kürzend, ergänzend"; see G. HÖLSCHER, "Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia", *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. KAUTZSCH - A. BERTHOLET; Tübingen 1923) II, 551; see also J. BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra - Nehemiah. A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia 1988) 323-324.

<sup>(18)</sup> This opinion is shared by many scholars; see, for example, L.W. BATTEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (ICC; Edinburgh 1913) 267; W. RUDOLF, *Esra und Nehemia* (HAT 20; Tübingen 1949) 183; IDEM, *Chronikbücher*, 83; L.C. ALLEN, *The First and Second Books of Chronicles*. Introduction, Commentary and Reflections (The New Interpreter's Bible 3; Nashville, TN 1999) 362. For a survey of other opinions, see G.N. KNOPPERS, "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9", *Textus* 20 (2000) 141-168 esp. 141-145.

<sup>(19)</sup> From a literary view, the list in 1 Chr 9,3-34 is formed in *inclusio*: the list opens

Contrary to the author of Nehemiah 11 who informs us that “the rest of the people drew lots to bring one out of ten to live in Jerusalem, the holy city” (verse 1), the Chronicler does not offer any information indicating the urgency to increase the population of Jerusalem, and that families were — as a matter of fact — forced to settle in the city. By omitting, too, the second verse of Nehemiah 11, which informs us that there were some other people who volunteered to live in Jerusalem, the Chronicler actually ‘threw out the baby with the dirty water’. Nevertheless, he emphasizes that not only people from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, Priests and Levites lived in Jerusalem as listed in Nehemiah (Neh 11,4,10,16 // 1 Chr 9,3a,10,14), but also descendants of the northern tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh (1 Chr 9,3b - an ‘addition’ to Neh 11,4)<sup>(20)</sup>. Consequently, the picture that emerges from Chronicles is that Jerusalem was inhabited *willingly* by all the Israelites. The city was the center of the whole nation, of the northern as well as of the southern tribes.

Although the Chronicler integrated in his work the lists of those who inhabited Jerusalem as related in Nehemiah, he avoided utilizing the title עיר הקודש “the holy city” which appears twice in his *Vorlage* (Neh 11,1.18)<sup>(21)</sup>. Neither did he use any other title / name instead, such as עיר יהוה “the City of the Lord” or עיר אלהים “the City of God”, which were used in other Scriptural passages such as Isa 60,14; Ps 87,3 (see also Ps 46,5; 101,8). This fact is noteworthy especially against the background that the Chronicler recognized Jerusalem as the chosen city of God, and as a place where the “Throne of the Lord” was located (1 Chr 28,5b; 29,23a)<sup>(22)</sup>.

Why was the post-exilic list of Jerusalem’s residents located in the book of Chronicles (1 Chr 9,2-34), though it interrupts the genealogy of the house of Saul (1 Chr 8,29-38) and the tragic death of Saul and his sons on mount Gilboa (1 Chr 10 // 1 Sam 31)? The answer lies probably in the evidence that Jerusalem’s inhabitants and Temple’s staff seem to be the “climax” of the genealogical lists in 1 Chr 1–9. The author opens with *Adam and all the nations* which were formed from his descendants (1 Chr 1). He continues in detail on the *Israelite tribes* (1 Chr 2–8) with special attention to *Judah* (1 Chr 2-4; while locating *Davidic* descendants in its center, 1 Chr 3) as well as the tribe of *Levi* (1 Chr 5,27–6,66), and concludes with the *Jerusalem inhabitants* who embrace the Temple staff: Priests, Levites, Gatekeepers,

---

with the words “And in Jerusalem dwelt...” (verse 3a // Neh 11,4a) and closes with the same words “These dwell at Jerusalem” (verse 34b, an “addition”), see KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 270-271; IDEM, *Chronicles*, 304-305. Thus, Beentjes’ discussion on “the relation between the tribe of Benjamin and Jerusalem” (pp. 21-22), which depends on 1 Chr 9,3a,34b, makes no sense, since the two phrases are meant to build the literary feature only.

<sup>(20)</sup> RUDOLF, *Esra und Nehemia*, 184 is of opinion that the words “Ephraim and Manasseh” appeared in the earlier text of Neh 11,4. There is, however, no textual evidence for such an argument.

<sup>(21)</sup> It appears also in the late prophetic texts such as Isa 48,2; 52,1 and Dan 9,24. See also Tob 13,9; Matt 4,5; 27,53; Rev 11,2 and later on in the Arabic *al quds* for Jerusalem.

<sup>(22)</sup> On this issue, see I. KALIMI, “The Representation of Jerusalem in the Chronic Writing Compared with the Earlier and Later Jewish Compositions”, *Ralf W. Klein Festschrift* (JSOTSS; Sheffield 2003).



Singers (1 Chr 9,3-34), and the Gibeonites who served in the Temple and dwelt in the city (*ibid.* 9,35-38)<sup>(23)</sup>. In order to achieve the literary effect of climax the Chronicler placed the list of Jerusalem's inhabitants between the list of Saul's house and Saul's collapse in the war with the Philistines<sup>(24)</sup>. Subsequently, he created a literary proximity between the former (1 Chr 8,29-38) and the latter (1 Chr 10) by listing once again the genealogy of Saul's house in 1 Chr 9,39-44 (*Wiederaufnahme*)<sup>(25)</sup>.

#### IV. Conclusion

The essay reviews the representation of Jerusalem in the introductory part of the Chronistic history (1 Chr 1-9). Jerusalem is mentioned here in the list of the descendants of David; in the list of the Levites and at the end of the part.

All the presentations of the city in the genealogical prologue are prior to David's conquest of Jerusalem (1 Chr 11,4-7 // 2 Sam 5,6-9)<sup>(26)</sup>, likewise the mentioning of the Jerusalem Temple (1 Chr 5,36; 6,16-17) is prior to its construction by Solomon (2 Chr 2-7 // 1 Kgs 5,16-9,9). These appearances are early allusions to the importance of the city and its functions in the narrative parts of the book, that is, in the histories of David's reign (1 Chr 10-29); of Solomon's reign (2 Chr 1-9); and that of the Judean kings (2 Chr 10-36).

The Chronicler emphasizes that Solomon and all the rulers of Judah, that is, all the chosen dynasty's kings were born in Jerusalem. The repetitive information mentioning that the Temple was built in Jerusalem may be stressed to point out the unique holiness of the Chronicler's own Jerusalem.

The list of Jerusalem's residents depends on those in Neh 11 and on an additional one that has no parallel in other known sources. This list is used as a climax of the whole section, 1 Chr 1-9. According to the Chronicler all the Israelites inhabited Jerusalem willingly, and the city was used as a center for the whole nation during the whole monarchic period.

DePaul University  
Department of Religious Studies  
2320 N. Kenmore Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60614 (USA)

Isaac KALIMI

<sup>(23)</sup> Compare M. OEMING, *Das wahre Israel*. Die "genealogische Vorhalle" 1-9 (BWANT 128; Stuttgart - Berlin - Köln 1990) 209-210. The list of Benjaminites in Gibeon and Jerusalem (verses 35-38 // Neh 11,31-36) provided here once again (see 1 Chr 8,29-32) probably because they served in the Temple (Josh 9,23,27), and at least some of them lived in Jerusalem (8,32b // 9,38b). The genealogy of Saul (verses 39-44), is used here as an exposition to the story of Saul in 1 Chr 10.

<sup>(24)</sup> Contra Benzinger who is of the opinion that the Chronicler himself did not insert the list under consideration into his book, but someone else later on, an "Interpolator". See I. BENZINGER, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (KHKAT 20; Tübingen and Leipzig 1901) 35. Similarly, Gallin considers 1 Chr 9,1-34 as a "late addition"; see K. GALLIN, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia* (ATD 12; Berlin 1958) 38.

<sup>(25)</sup> For this phenomenon in the book of Chronicles, see KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung*, 235-248; IDEM, *Chronicles*, 263-278.

<sup>(26)</sup> On this issue see I. KALIMI, "The Capture of Jerusalem in the Chronistic History", *VT* 52 (2002) 66-79.

## SUMMARY

All the appearances of Jerusalem in the ethnographical prologue of Chronicles are prior to David's capture of it. Equally, the mentioning of the Jerusalem Temple is prior to its building by Solomon. These appearances are early allusions to the importance of the city and its functions in the narrative sections of the book. The Chronicler stresses that all the chosen dynasty's kings were born in Jerusalem. The repetitive mentioning that the Temple was constructed in Jerusalem may be intended to point out the exclusive holiness of the Chronicler's own Jerusalem. The list of Jerusalem's residents relies on those in Nehemiah and on an additional one that has no parallel in other sources. This list is used as a climax of the entire section (1 Chr 1-9). According to the Chronicler all the Israelites settled in Jerusalem freely, and the city was used as a center for the entire nation during the whole kingdom era.

## RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

### **Der historische Jesus in seinem jüdischen Umfeld Eine Bestandsaufnahme angesichts der neueren Diskussion**

Seit den achtziger Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts lässt sich eine intensive Neuaufnahme der Frage nach dem historischen Jesus konstatieren (sog. "Third Quest"). Kennzeichnend dabei ist eine Abwendung von der die Forschung lange Zeit beschäftigenden Problematik nach dem Verhältnis von historischem Jesus und Entstehung des christlichen Glaubens. An deren Stelle ist eine Bestandsaufnahme dessen, was sich wissenschaftlich verantwortet über die historische Person Jesu sagen lässt, getreten. Diese, auf breiter Quellenbasis sowie von unterschiedlichen Perspektiven aus in Angriff genommene Forschung hat bereits eine Vielzahl von Jesusdarstellungen hervorgebracht, die untereinander wesentlich stärker differieren, als dies in früheren Phasen der Fall war.

In diesen forschungsgeschichtlichen Kontext ist auch das in der Reihe Anchor Bible Reference Library (ABRL) unter dem Obertitel "A Marginal Jew" erscheinende Werk John P. Meiers einzuordnen, von dem bislang drei Bände vorliegen. Band 1 und 2 erschienen 1992 bzw. 1994, mit etwas größerem zeitlichen Abstand wurde nun vor kurzem Band 3 publiziert<sup>(1)</sup>. Im selben Zeitraum sind zudem zahlreiche Aufsätze des Autors erschienen — zum Teil auch in dieser Zeitschrift —, die sich mit Einzelfragen der Jesusforschung befassen und das Hauptwerk auf diese Weise flankierend begleiten<sup>(2)</sup>.

Mit Erstaunen steht man zunächst vor dem Umfang des — noch nicht abgeschlossenen — Projektes: Die Bände 1 und 2 umfassen zusammen 1482 Seiten Text und Anmerkungen, dazu kommen jetzt noch einmal 703 Seiten — und es folgt noch Band 4, der sich u.a. mit Gefangennahme und Kreuzigung befassen wird. "Apart from the verbosity of the author (the modern, not the ancient one), why the apparent overkill?" fragte sich Meier angesichts dieser Breite der Darstellung bereits in Band 2 (1) — damals noch, um zu begründen, dass sein Werk nicht aus zwei, sondern aus drei Bänden bestehen würde. Nun werden es (voraussichtlich) deren vier sein, und damit wird Meier zweifellos das umfangreichste Werk über den historischen Jesus an der Wende vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert vorgelegt haben.

Als Gründe für dieses Ausmaß gibt er in Band 2 an: Die Reihe, in der das Werk erscheint, wolle nicht nur eine Position darstellen, sondern auch über die Forschungsdiskussion informieren. Diese sei gegenwärtig jedoch derart

<sup>(1)</sup> J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, Vol. III: Companions and Competitors (New York 2001).

<sup>(2)</sup> J.P. MEIER, "The Present State of the 'Third Quest' for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain", *Bib* 80 (1999) 459-487; Id., "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What can be Said?", *Bib* 81 (2000) 202-232.

komplex, dass es einer genauen Einbeziehung ihrer Resultate sowie einer sorgfältigen Auseinandersetzung mit den verschiedenen Zugangsweisen bedürfe. Schließlich müssten die eigenen Urteile bezüglich der Historizität einzelner Überlieferungen auf eine detaillierte Argumentation gestützt werden und dürften nicht — was in der Vergangenheit leider zu oft geschehen sei — mit ein paar leicht dahingeworfenen Sätzen abgetan werden. Diesen, vom Autor zur eigenen Exkulpation vorgebrachten Gründen ließe sich aus der Sicht des Rezipienten noch hinzufügen, dass die klare Aufteilung in Haupttext und folgenden (oft umfangreicheren) Anmerkungsteil die Lesbarkeit eines derart monumentalen Werkes deutlich erhöht. Auch der nicht an Detailinformationen zur Forschungsgeschichte und zu Einzelfragen der Quellenauswertung Interessierte bekommt so über den Haupttext einen raschen Zugang zu dem Buch.

Nachdem in Band 1 die methodischen und quellenmäßigen Grundentscheidungen dargelegt worden waren (Untertitel: "The Roots of the Problem and the Person") und sich Band 2 mit dem Verhältnis von Johannes und Jesus, der Gottesherrschaft als dem Zentrum der Botschaft Jesu sowie den Wundern befasst hatte (Untertitel: "Mentor, Message, and Miracles"), geht es nunmehr um Jesus in seinem Verhältnis zu Nachfolgern und Konkurrenten. Dies sei notwendiger Bestandteil einer Jesusdarstellung, da eine historische Person nur innerhalb ihrer sozialen Beziehungen angemessen verstanden werden könne<sup>(3)</sup>. Zugleich werde auf diese Weise ein signifikantes Defizit der neueren, durch die Medien unterstützten amerikanischen Jesusforschung (im Visier sind hier vornehmlich Autoren wie John D. Crossan und Burton L. Mack sowie das Jesus Seminar) vermieden. Der Anspruch der "Third Quest", Jesus als palästinischen Juden des 1. Jahrhunderts ernst zu nehmen, werde nämlich von Modellen wie Jesus dem Kyniker, dem Vertreter einer ländlichen Bevölkerung der Mittelmeerwelt oder dem Sozialrevolutionär überschattet und folglich nicht wirklich eingelöst (3). Meier macht hier zu Recht auf ein durch die einseitige Orientierung an der Wortüberlieferung hervorgerufenes Problem der genannten Forschungsrichtung aufmerksam, dem er mit seinem eigenen Werk ein Korrektiv entgegensetzen möchte. Jesus soll in das Netz der Beziehungen, die ihn mit seinen jüdischen Landsleuten — Sympathisanten wie Gegnern — verbinden, eingezeichnet und auf diese Weise als Jude seiner Zeit ernst genommen werden.

Das Buch gliedert sich in eine Einführung ("Jesus the Jew in his Relations to other Jews"), zwei Hauptteile, die die Kapitel 24-30 des Gesamtwerks beinhalten, sowie ein Schlußkapitel ("Integrating Jesus' Jewish Relationships into the wider Picture"). Die Einführung beschreibt Anliegen und Aufbau des Bandes und erinnert noch einmal an methodische Grundentscheidungen des Gesamtprojektes: (1) Der Haupttitel "A Marginal Jew" soll die eigentümliche Redeweise Jesu über sich selbst (Beispiel: "Menschensohn") imitieren und zugleich anzeigen, dass Jesus in jüdischen und heidnischen Quellen der ersten ca. einhundert Jahre nach seiner Kreuzigung kaum wahrgenommen wurde. (2) Der Ausdruck "historischer Jesus" bezeichnet ein Konstrukt, das mit Hilfe wissenschaftlicher Methoden

<sup>(3)</sup> "No human being is adequately understood if he or she is considered in isolation from other human beings" (1-2).

historischer Forschung erstellt wird. Dieses Konstrukt sei sowohl von der realen Person Jesu als auch von einem mit systematisch-theologischen (christologischen) Methoden und Kriterien erstellten Bild zu unterscheiden. Letzteres verdeutlicht Meier anhand des bereits in den früheren Bänden entworfenen Szenario eines "unpapal conclave": Ein Katholik, ein Protestant, ein Jude sowie ein Agnostiker werden in der Bibliothek der Harvard Divinity School eingeschlossen und auf Diät gesetzt, bis sie ein Konsensdokument über den historischen Jesus erstellt haben. Dieses Dokument habe "on purely historical sources and arguments" zu basieren und sei deshalb für jeden, der dieselben Methoden anwendet, überprüfbar (9-10). Auf dieses Bild und den damit veranschaulichten methodischen Ansatz wird noch zurückzukommen sein. (3) Schließlich wiederholt Meier die in Band 1 entwickelten Kriterien, an denen er seine historische Bewertung des Quellenmaterials orientiert: das "Verlegenheitskriterium" (Ereignisse, die schwerlich erfunden sein können, weil sie der frühen Kirche Verlegenheit bereiteten); das Kriterium der Diskontinuität (Worte oder Taten Jesu, die weder aus dem Judentum noch als Bildungen der frühen Kirche erklärbar sind); das Kriterium der Mehrfachbezeugung; das Kohärenzkriterium sowie das Kriterium der Ablehnung und Hinrichtung Jesu (Worte und Taten, die zu diesen Ereignissen geführt oder zumindest beigetragen haben). Diese Kriterien tauchen innerhalb der Darstellung immer wieder auf und dienen zur Begründung von Historizitätsurteilen. Bezüglich der Quellenlage hatte Meier bereits in Band 1 dargelegt, dass er die kanonischen Evangelien als Primärzeugnisse betrachtet, die durch einige wenige außerchristliche Quellen zu ergänzen seien. Die gegenwärtig für historische Rekonstruktionen mitunter hoch gehandelten apokryphen Schriften würden dagegen — ebenso wenig wie rabbinische Quellen — keine historisch zuverlässigen Informationen enthalten<sup>(4)</sup>. Teil 1 ("Jesus the Jew and his Jewish Followers", Kapitel 24-27) ist nach dem Modell dreier konzentrischer Kreise, beginnend mit dem äußeren, aufgebaut. Behandelt wird zunächst das Volk als Adressat der Botschaft Jesu. Obwohl die Evangelien mit den Berufungen von Jüngern beginnen, hält Meier es für ein historisch angemessenes Verfahren, die Darstellung von einer stärker allgemeinen Ausrichtung des Wirkens Jesu zum Speziellen (der Installation des Zwölferkreises) fortschreiten zu lassen.

Jesus habe aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach große Aufmerksamkeit unter der jüdischen Bevölkerung erregt und größere Menschenmengen angezogen. Hierfür sprächen sowohl das Kriterium der Mehrfachbezeugung (alle Evangelien bezeugen Volksmengen um Jesus) als auch das "argument from coherence with Jesus' death": Die Kreuzigung sei historisch wesentlich plausibler, wenn Jesus als Aufrührer wahrgenommen und hingerichtet wurde. In dieselbe Richtung weise auch das Testimonium Flavianum, da Josephus unmittelbar von der Erwähnung der durch Jesus angezogenen Juden zur Notiz von seiner Kreuzigung übergeht (die Bemerkung ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν beurteilt Meier mit vielen anderen als christliche Ergänzung).

<sup>(4)</sup> J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, Vol. I: The Roots of the Problem and the Person (New York 1991) 140: "In Part One of this book, we have been sitting on the beach, sorting the dragnet and throwing the *agrapha*, apocryphal gospels, and the *Gospel of Thomas* back into the sea".

In der Konsequenz dieser Einsicht liegt nach Meier die Revision des traditionellen Bildes von einer ungetrübten ersten Phase des Wirkens Jesu, die mit einer Abwendung vieler Nachfolger geendet habe. Dieses Bild basiere im wesentlichen auf Joh 6,66 (ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν), sei jedoch angesichts des Quellenbefundes zu korrigieren: Jesus habe nicht nur während seines galiläischen Wirkens, sondern bis zum Ende größere Volksmengen an sich gezogen, und dies habe wesentlich zu seiner Hinrichtung beigetragen.

Dass Joh 6,66 für die Beurteilung der Anhängerschaft Jesu während seiner Wirksamkeit in Galiläa und Jerusalem in der Forschung eine derart ausschlaggebende Rolle spielt, mag man bezweifeln. Bemerkenswert bleibt gleichwohl der Hinweis, zwischen beiden Phasen sei keine schroffe Trennlinie zu ziehen. Das Nebeneinander von Sympathie und Ablehnung könnte vielmehr ein Merkmal sein, das die Wirksamkeit Jesu von Anfang an kennzeichnete. Dies würde die historische Plausibilität einer Rekonstruktion insofern erhöhen, als man nicht damit rechnen müsste, dass seine Botschaft erst später auf Ablehnung gestoßen sei (wofür es keinen ersichtlichen Grund gibt). Ein solches Bild hätte zudem, worauf Meier nicht eigens hinweist, Anhalt an der mk Darstellung, wo sowohl die sich um Jesus sammelnde Volksmenge als auch der erste Hinweis auf massive Feindschaft schon sehr früh begegnen.

In den nächsten Kapiteln werden die Kreise enger gezogen: Besprochen werden zunächst die Jünger (25), sodann die Zwölf (26), ein Kapitel über die einzelnen Personen des Zwölferkreises (27) schließt den Teil ab. Jesus habe demnach einen Kreis von Jüngern um sich gesammelt, der nicht identisch mit dem Zwölferkreis war, sondern mehr Personen (darunter auch Frauen, obwohl das Femininum μαθήτρια nicht in den Evangelien, sondern nur einmal in Apg 9,36 begegnet) umfaßte. Meier stellt den auffälligen Befund heraus, dass der Terminus μαθητής nicht nur in den neutestamentlichen Schriften (außer Evangelien und Apg), sondern auch in der LXX sowie den meisten Schriften der Apostolischen Väter fehlt. Dagegen begegnet er bei Philo und Josephus, bei letzterem auch zur Beschreibung des Verhältnisses von Elia und Elisa (Ant. 8,354: Elisa als μαθητής καὶ διάκονος des Elia; cf. 9,28.33) sowie zur Bezeichnung Johannes Hyrkans als eines μαθητής der Pharisäer (Ant. 13,289; ähnlich 15,3: der Pharisäer Pollion und sein μαθητής Samaïas). Dieser Befund deute auf ein hellenistisches Milieu, das sowohl für den von Johannes als auch für den von Jesus ins Leben gerufenen Kreis von μαθηταῖ vorauszusetzen sei. Die von Jesus initiierte Bewegung sei deshalb im Spektrum von Schulbildungen der griechisch-römischen Welt anzusiedeln. Die für Jesus kennzeichnende Verbindung von eschatologischem Prophet und Wundertäter müsse jedoch auch für die Prägung seines Schülerkreises berücksichtigt werden, zu dessen Charakteristik deshalb die Berufung Elisais durch Elia eine nähere Analogie darstelle als kynische Philosophenschulen und der rabbinische Lehrbetrieb<sup>(5)</sup>.

Für den Jüngerkreis Jesu werden deshalb folgende Merkmale

<sup>(5)</sup> Die Analogie zwischen Elia und Jesus hatte Meier bereits früher betont: "Present State", 471. 482-483: In beiden Fällen handle es sich um Wunder wirkende eschatologische Propheten.

festgehalten: Die Initiative zum Eintritt in die Nachfolge gehe immer von Jesus aus; Nachfolge bedeute das Aufgeben bisheriger Bindungen und ein tatsächliches Mitgehen mit Jesus; Jesus mache seine Nachfolger zudem auf die Folgen der Zugehörigkeit zu seinem Jüngerkreis aufmerksam, die zu erbitterter Feindschaft führe, sogar von der eigenen Familie. Letzteres wird anhand einer ausführlichen Analyse der Worte über das Leben gewinnen und verlieren (Mk 8,35 parr.) sowie über die Kreuzesnachfolge (Mk 8,34/Q 14,27) dargelegt. Die Zugehörigkeit zu Jesus sei somit durch eine Teilhabe an dessen eigenem Geschick gekennzeichnet.

Im Kapitel über den Zwölferkreis wird dessen Existenz auf eine Zeichenhandlung des historischen Jesus zurückgeführt. Hierauf weise schon der Überlieferungsbefund, denn der Kreis sei sowohl bei Mk als auch in Q (22,30, Meier vertritt die Version von Mt 19,28, in der auch die zwölf Throne erwähnt werden) belegt. Gegenteilige Auffassungen seien dagegen, wie in Auseinandersetzung mit den Thesen von Klein, Vielhauer, Schmithals und Crossan ausgeführt wird, als voreingenommen zurückzuweisen. Dagegen sprächen die geringe Bedeutung, die der Zwölferkreis in der frühen Kirche tatsächlich besaß, sowie der Verrat des Judas. Diese Auffassung dürfte heute weitgehend konsensfähig sein. Auf dieser Basis wird dann auch die Aussendung als eine Symbolhandlung der auf die endzeitliche Sammlung Israels ausgerichteten Wirksamkeit Jesu gedeutet. In diesem Kontext findet sich noch einmal (vgl. bereits die ausführliche Behandlung dieses Themas in Band 2) ein Abschnitt zur Vorstellung von der Gottesherrschaft in Texten des Frühjudentums als Hintergrund der Verkündigung Jesu.

Das letzte Kapitel des ersten Teils behandelt schließlich die einzelnen Mitglieder des Zwölferkreises anhand der überlieferten Namenslisten sowie — wenn vorhanden — weiterer Notizen, wobei der Ertrag naturgemäß gering ist, da sich aufgrund der Quellenlage — mit Ausnahme von Petrus, in geringerem Maß von Judas und Johannes — wenig bis nichts über diese Personen sagen lässt. Man fragt sich deshalb, ob dieses Kapitel den Umfang des Bandes nicht unnötig anschwellen lässt.

Ohne Zweifel basieren die Ausführungen von Teil 1 auf einer stupenden Kenntnis der Forschung, die in den Anmerkungen ausführlich dokumentiert wird. Methodisch ist überzeugend, dass Meier seine Urteile stets auf eine durchsichtige Analyse des Quellenmaterials sowie die Anwendung der von ihm eingangs benannten Kriterien gründet, auf die er in der Auswertung des Materials immer wieder hinweist. Mitunter wäre jedoch eine Konzentration auf Wesentliches der Darstellung zugute gekommen, zumal sich Meier über weite Strecken innerhalb eines breit anerkannten Konsenses bewegt. Die Darstellung wird zudem mitunter dadurch unübersichtlich, dass unvermittelt exkursartige Ausführungen (etwa zur Gottesherrschaft oder zur Historizität der Kreuzigung) auftauchen, Auseinandersetzungen mit abweichenden Positionen, die in Fußnoten hätten geführt werden können, den Haupttext bisweilen über einige Seiten dominieren und das Verhältnis zwischen exegetischer Einzelanalyse und übergreifenden Aussagen mitunter nicht recht klar wird. (Warum werden z.B. die synoptischen Überlieferungsverhältnisse zu Mk 8,34f. ausführlich diskutiert, wogegen die synoptischen Berufungszählungen keiner entsprechenden Analyse unterzogen werden?)

Auch ist nicht immer deutlich, wie Meier vom Text zu historischen

Urteilen über die Wirklichkeit, auf die sich dieser bezieht, gelangt. Das Verfahren, die synoptischen Überlieferungsverhältnisse zu analysieren und sodann die genannten Kriterien anzuwenden, wirkt bisweilen etwas schematisch. Hier hätte man sich eine die literarischen und archäologischen Zeugnisse über das Palästina des 1. Jahrhunderts stärker einbeziehende, dem Leser ein Bild der Person Jesu inmitten dieser Welt und ihrer Menschen vor Augen stellende historische Darstellung gewünscht.

Um ein Beispiel zu nennen: In den Ausführungen über Petrus werden die ntl. Texte nacheinander besprochen und jeweils auf ihre Historizität hin befragt (wobei auf dem Felsenwort in Mt 16,17-19 noch einmal besonderes Augenmerk liegt, das als nachösterliche Bildung beurteilt wird). Die Auslegungen dieser Texte sind einleuchtend und stellen gute Beispiele redaktionskritischer und historischer Analysen dar. Von einer historischen *Darstellung* würde man jedoch erwarten, dass sie auf der Grundlage derartiger Analysen ein deutlicher konturiertes Bild der Person des Petrus und ihrer Bedeutung für die frühe Jesusbewegung zeichnet. Dies sucht man jedoch vergeblich. Gerade angesichts des methodisch vorbildlichen Verfahrens von Meier beim Umgang mit den Quellen hätte man sich mitunter gewünscht, dass die Darstellung nicht bei einer kritischen Analyse stehenbleibt, sondern zu einer Interpretation voranschreitet, die die Quellen zu einem lebendigen Bild von der Vergangenheit zusammensetzt.

Teil 2 ("Jesus the Jew and his Jewish Competitors", Kapitel 28-30) behandelt die Pharisäer (28), Sadduzäer (29) sowie die Essener und andere jüdische Gruppen (30). Am Beginn des Kapitels über die Pharisäer steht ein knapper Überblick über die historische Entwicklung des nachexilischen Judentums, während derer sich die genannten Gruppierungen herausgebildet haben. Anschließend werden die zur Verfügung stehenden Quellen — das Neue Testament, Josephus sowie rabbinische Texte — daraufhin befragt, was sie in historischer Hinsicht über die Pharisäer zu erkennen geben. Sowohl das Neue Testament als auch Josephus seien nur mit Vorsicht für eine historische Bewertung der Pharisäer heranzuziehen, da ihr jeweiliges Bild von einer dezidiert negativen Haltung dieser Gruppe gegenüber geprägt und entsprechend tendenziös sei. Die rabbinischen Texte könnten ohnehin nur mit großer Zurückhaltung für ein Bild des Pharisäismus vor 70 in Anspruch genommen werden, da aufgrund der bekannten Datierungsprobleme in jedem Einzelfall sorgfältig geprüft werden müsse, ob eine ältere Tradition aufgenommen wurde. Dazu kommt, wie Meier zu Recht bemerkt, dass sich nach gegenwärtigem Urteil keine Schriften (auch nicht PsSal) zweifelsfrei als pharisäisch charakterisieren lassen, so dass eine historische Rekonstruktion ohne einen Bezug auf sichere Originaltexte auskommen muss.

Meier ordnet sich hier in die neuere Forschung (Stemberger, Neusner) ein, die wesentlich zurückhaltender darüber urteilt, was wir von den Pharisäern vor dem Jahr 70 tatsächlich wissen können<sup>(6)</sup>. Aufgrund dieser vorsichtigen Beurteilung der Quellenlage gelangt er dann auch nur zu einem "minimalist sketch", bestehend aus 6 Punkten: (1) Es handle sich bei den

<sup>(6)</sup> Vgl. auch seine Auseinandersetzung mit Roland Deines: J.P. MEIER, "The Quest for the Historical Pharisee: A Review Essay on Roland Deines, *Die Pharisäer*", *CBQ* 61 (1999) 713-722.



Pharisäern um eine jüdische Gruppierung mit politischen und religiösen Ambitionen, die vor dem (ersten) Jüdischen Krieg aktiv gewesen sei. (2) Sie hätten das mosaische Gesetz genau beachtet. (3) Innerhalb einer größeren Auseinandersetzung innerhalb des Judentums zur Zeitenwende um die angemessene Interpretation der Tora sei die pharisäische Position durch die Beachtung auch mündlicher Traditionen gekennzeichnet, die sie im Volk proklamiert habe. (4) Hierbei habe es sich vorrangig um Reinheitsvorschriften, die Verzehntung, das Sabbatgebot sowie Vorschriften über Ehe und Ehescheidung gehandelt. (5) Möglicherweise ließen sich den Pharisäern der Auferstehungsglaube sowie messianische Erwartungen zuschreiben. Hierfür könnte auch das Selbstzeugnis des Paulus sprechen. (6) Josephus führt aus, dass die Pharisäer an eine göttliche Vorsehung glaubten, dabei gleichwohl nicht die Freiheit des Menschen, zwischen Gut und Böse zu wählen, leugneten. Damit nähmen sie eine Mittelposition zwischen Essenern und Sadduzäern ein. Trotz der Tendenz des Josephus, die von ihm genannten jüdischen Gruppen als philosophische Schulen darzustellen, ließe sich dies historisch auswerten: Die Pharisäer glaubten daran, dass Gott die Geschichte Israels bis zur Vollendung — dem Richten der Lebendigen und Toten — lenke, sie hielten andererseits an der Verantwortung Israels fest, die Gebote Gottes zu beachten. Diese Merkmale profilieren die Pharisäer nach Meier als eine Gruppe, die nicht — wie bisweilen angenommen — den “common Judaism” ihrer Zeit vertritt.

Auf dieser Grundlage wird sodann die Rolle der Pharisäer innerhalb der Geschichte Jesu skizziert. Für historisch wahrscheinlich könnten vornehmlich die Auseinandersetzung über die Ehescheidung, die Weherufe, das etwa in Lk 18,10-14 zum Ausdruck kommende negative Bild eines Pharisäers sowie die Sympathie einzelner Pharisäer Jesus gegenüber (Nikodemus in Joh 3 und 7; Simon in Lk 7) gelten. Die Pharisäer seien damit als diejenige jüdische Gruppe zu betrachten, mit der Jesus am intensivsten in Kontakt gekommen sei und sich am meisten auseinandergesetzt habe — was angesichts ihres Bestrebens, in der Öffentlichkeit Einfluß auszuüben, auch nicht erstaunlich sei. Bemerkenswert sei schließlich der Kontrast dieses Bildes zu ihrer fast völligen Abwesenheit bei den Passionsereignissen.

Das Kapitel über die Sadduzäer ist in eine historische Bestandsaufnahme und eine ausführliche Behandlung von Mk 12,18-27 aufgeteilt. Mit familiären Wurzeln in priesterlichen Familien und guten Verbindungen zur politischen und ökonomischen Oberschicht Judäas, stellten sie nach Josephus unter römischer Herrschaft im Jahr 62 sogar den Hohenpriester (Ananus). Meier zufolge lässt sich wahrscheinlich machen, dass dies noch öfter der Fall gewesen sei. Sie seien daher als religiöse und politische Gruppierung zu verstehen, die vor allem auf den Jerusalemer Tempel und den Hohenpriester konzentriert gewesen sei, im Volk dagegen wenig Einfluß besaß. Über ihre spezifischen Anschauungen lasse sich kaum ein klares Bild gewinnen, außer dass sie vermutlich über die schriftliche Tora hinausgehenden Überlieferungen keinen autoritativen Status zuerkannten und der apokalyptischen Bewegung und ihrer Auferstehungshoffnung ablehnend gegenüberstanden.

Der einzige ntl. Text, der historisch im Blick auf die Sadduzäer auswertbar sei, sei der Disput über die Auferstehung in Mk 12, da die Sadduzäer ansonsten — anders als die Pharisäer — kaum eine Rolle

innerhalb der urchristlichen Texte spielen. Meier unternimmt deshalb eine detaillierte Interpretation dieses Textes, der zunächst als Streitgespräch bestimmt, sodann innerhalb seines mk Kontextes ausgelegt wird. Diese Exegese geht freilich weit über die eigentliche Fragestellung des Kapitels hinaus. Im Ergebnis urteilt Meier, es handle sich um eine bereits vormk existierende Überlieferung, die aufgrund ihrer Eigenart für den historischen Jesus reklamiert werden könne. Die Frage der Auferstehung werde hier auf charakteristisch andere Weise verhandelt als in der frühen Kirche, die diese stets auf die bereits geschehene Auferstehung Jesu, jedoch nicht auf die Schrift gestützt habe. Das Argument ist freilich nur zum Teil überzeugend, da ersteres für einen Disput Jesu aus naheliegenden Gründen ohnehin entfällt. Zutreffend ist freilich die Beobachtung, dass Ex 3,6 in urchristlichen Texten (mit der möglichen Ausnahme Apg 3,13, wo es sich aber nur auf die Auferstehung *Jesu* beziehen würde) ansonsten nie zur Begründung des Auferstehungsglaubens herangezogen wird.

Diesen Befund ordnet Meier sodann in das weitere Spektrum eschatologischer und auf das Endgericht bezogener Aussagen Jesu ein. Diese ließen sich mit dem Argument der Mehrfachbezeugung dafür anführen, dass der im Disput mit den Sadduzäern zum Ausdruck kommende Glaube an die Auferstehung der Toten als Bestandteil der eschatologischen Erwartungen des historischen Jesus aufzufassen sei.

Das letzte Kapitel behandelt "The Essenes and Other Groups" — womit die Samaritaner, die Schriftgelehrten, die Herodianer und die Zeloten gemeint sind. Den umfangreichsten Teil nimmt dabei die Behandlung der Essener und Qumran ein (die in Qumran ansässige Gemeinschaft wird also der essenischen Bewegung zugeordnet), wiewohl Meier gleich zu Beginn darauf hinweist, dass es zwischen diesen und Jesus keine direkten Kontakte gegeben habe und alle diesbezüglichen sensationalistischen Thesen ins Reich der Phantasie verweist. Die Darstellung der Analogien betrifft im einzelnen: Eschatologie, Haltung zum Tempel sowie gesetzliche, ethische und rituelle Verhaltensregeln. Bezüglich der Eschatologie ließen sich die Spannung zwischen gegenwärtigem und futurischem Aspekt in der Vorstellung der Gottesherrschaft sowie die Messiasvorstellungen als Vergleichspunkte benennen (besonders hingewiesen wird auf das in der neueren Diskussion vielbeachtete Fragment 4Q521). Sowohl Jesus als auch die Qumrangemeinschaft richteten ihr besonderes Interesse auf den Tempel — wobei jener dem gegenwärtig existierenden Tempel sogar positiver gegenübergestanden habe als diese, die ihn als unrein beurteilten, wogegen Jesus ihn als Bestandteil der gegenwärtigen Ordnung Gottes für Israel betrachtet habe. Wie sich dieses Urteil mit dem Tempelwort verträgt, wird jedoch nicht recht klar. In bezug auf die Verhaltensregeln werden die jeweilige Stellung zu Sexualität und Ehe, zum Schwurgebot sowie zum Besitz verglichen. Es ergeben sich jeweils eigene Akzentsetzungen, wobei gleichwohl auffällig bleibt, dass diese Bereiche jeweils als für die Haltung gegenüber Gott wichtig erachtet wurden.

Abschließend werden einige Differenzpunkte herausgestellt, die davor bewahren sollen, Jesus und die Qumrangemeinschaft zu nahe aneinander zu rücken: die Haltung gegenüber Detailvorschriften der Halacha, Interesse am Festkalender sowie die Einstellung zu hierarchischer Ordnung einerseits, das

auch für die Feinde geltende Liebesgebot sowie das Wunderwirken des Messias andererseits.

Die verbleibenden Teile tragen in historischer Hinsicht nicht mehr viel zum Gesamtbild bei: Jesus habe vermutlich ein freundliches Bild von den Samaritanern gehabt, auch wenn es zu seiner Zeit keine Samaritanermission gegeben habe. Die "Schriftgelehrten" seien keine homogene Gruppe gewesen, so dass hier auch nicht von einer Haltung Jesu gegenüber einer solchen gesprochen werden könne. Auch Herodianer und Zeloten seien keine Gruppen, bezüglich derer Informationen vorlägen, die das Spektrum, innerhalb dessen sich Jesus bewegt habe, erhellen könnten.

Teil 2 ist eine voluminöse, erschöpfende Präsentation des zur Verfügung stehenden Materials über die genannten jüdischen Gruppen sowie des Standes ihrer Erforschung. Jede wesentliche Quelle wird behandelt, nahezu jede neuere Veröffentlichung erwähnt und oft auch diskutiert. Verwiesen sei hier nur exemplarisch auf Anmerkung 4 zu Kapitel 28, die auf den eng bedruckten Seiten 342-346 (!) Literatur zu den Pharisäern auflistet und mit einer Auswertung schließt. Es handelt sich bei dieser "Anmerkung" in Wahrheit um einen Forschungsbericht in nuce. Mit dieser detaillierten Aufarbeitung des Forschungsstandes wird das Werk dem Anspruch der Reihe ABRL in hohem Maße gerecht.

Eine Frage freilich bleibt: Wenn — wie Meier selbst feststellt — die meisten Juden im Palästina des 1. Jahrhunderts *keiner* dieser Gruppen angehört (7) — warum konzentriert sich die Darstellung dann auf genau diese und widmet der Frage, inwiefern sich Jesus in die allgemein anerkannten Grundsätze des sog. "mainstream Judaism" einordnet, vergleichsweise wenig Aufmerksamkeit? Zweifellos kann eine gewisse Berechtigung hieraus aus der Tatsache bezogen werden, dass Jesus aufgrund seines Anspruchs sowie seines Einflusses im Volk gerade mit diesen (insonderheit mit den Pharisäern) in Konflikt geriet. Andererseits sollte jedoch der — von Meier zweifellos nicht beabsichtigte — Eindruck vermieden werden, das Profil Jesu sei vornehmlich durch die Abgrenzung von den genannten jüdischen Gruppen zu gewinnen. Es ließe sich zweifellos ein Bild des Juden Jesus zeichnen, das dessen Wirksamkeit — ganz im Sinne Meiers — als prophetisch ausgerichteten Appell an seine jüdischen Zeitgenossen versteht und seine Stellung innerhalb des Judentums weniger stark durch die Abgrenzung von den genannten jüdischen Parteien profiliert. Durch Band 2 wird dies zum Teil geleistet, wenn zunächst das Wirken Jesu selbst in den Blick genommen wird. Es hätte jedoch nahegelegen, an diese Linie auch in Band 3 deutlicher anzuknüpfen.

Das Buch schließt mit einer Ertragssicherung: "Integrating Jesus' Jewish Relationship into the Wider Picture". Dieser Abschnitt ordnet das Ergebnis von Band 3 in das bislang gewonnene Gesamtbild von "A Marginal Jew" ein: Es wird eine "Kurzbiographie" Jesu geboten, die seine Herkunft aus dem — jüdisch geprägten, politisch weitgehend stabilen — Galiläa, sein von Johannes inspiriertes Wirken als "Elija-like Prophet", die sich um ihn bildenden Kreise von Nachfolgern sowie die hierauf erfolgende Ablehnung von seiten seiner Gegner schildert — nunmehr in gegenüber der vorangegangenen Darstellung umgekehrter Reihenfolge, beginnend bei den Zeloten und bei den Pharisäern endend. Dieser Teil des Buches sei als

konkziser Überblick über das von Meier bislang erarbeitete Porträt des historischen Jesus besonders empfohlen.

Am Schluss steht ein Ausblick auf Band 4: "The Enigmas Jesus Posed and Was". In diesem sollen das Verhältnis Jesu zum Gesetz, die Gleichnisse, die Redeweise Jesu über sich selbst sowie die Ereignisse im Zusammenhang seiner Hinrichtung behandelt werden — man darf gespannt sein!

Meier bezieht mit seiner Darstellung einen klaren Standpunkt. Er entwirft ein profiliertes Jesusbild, basierend auf präziser Quellenkenntnis sowie einer in Umfang und Detailgenauigkeit atemberaubenden Behandlung der einschlägigen Forschungsliteratur. Hauptgegner ist dabei die vornehmlich durch Crossan, Mack und das Jesus Seminar inaugurierte Richtung der amerikanischen Forschung, der gegenüber Meiers Entwurf auf den kanonischen Evangelien sowie den maßgeblichen jüdischen Zeugnissen gründet, die ausführlich ausgewertet und auf ihren Wert für ein Bild Jesu als eines Juden im Palästina des 1. Jahrhunderts hin befragt werden. Völlig zu Recht wird die Darstellung also nicht auf die Wortüberlieferung konzentriert (die Gleichnisse werden aufgrund ihres rätselhaften Charakters sowie ihres ebensowenig offen am Tage liegenden Beitrags für ein Bild des historischen Jesus erst in Band 4 behandelt!), sondern an den Evangelien als kritisch zu analysierenden und durch weiteres Material zu ergänzenden historischen Quellen ausgerichtet. Damit wird einem Trend der Jesusforschung, der von Bultmanns Jesusbuch bis zu Crossans Darstellung reicht und sich in jüngerer Zeit mit der Forschung an Q und der apokryphen Jesusüberlieferung verbunden hat, ein fulminanter Entwurf gegenübergestellt. Mit seiner Betonung der Notwendigkeit, Jesus in sein jüdisches Umfeld einzuzeichnen, hat Meier dabei zugleich ein offensichtliches Manko dieser Richtung indiziert, deren Ausrichtung an der Wortüberlieferung mitunter einen Jesus gezeichnet hat, der seinen konkreten historischen Bezügen auf seltsame Weise enthoben ist und statt dessen zeitlos gültige Einsichten vermittelt.

Den Grundzügen und wesentlichen Ergebnissen von Meiers Darstellung werden deshalb viele zustimmen können, die der Beurteilung der apokryphen Überlieferung durch die genannte Richtung der "Third Quest" sowie einer Präferenz der Wortüberlieferung für die historische Rekonstruktion skeptisch gegenüberstehen. Dem überbordenden Anteil an Fußnoten steht allerdings ein in Aussagekraft und Innovation nicht immer korrespondierendes Ergebnis der Ausführungen im Haupttext gegenüber. Dies mag zum Teil an der Reihe liegen, in der das Werk erscheint und deren Anliegen es auch ist, über den Diskussionsstand zu informieren. Die Darstellung wird zudem des öfteren durch längere Rückblicke und Zusammenfassungen früherer Ausführungen unterbrochen. Auch wenn dies durchaus leserfreundlich und in didaktischer Hinsicht zuweilen geradezu vorbildlich ist<sup>(7)</sup>, stellt sich mit Blick auf den Umfang des Gesamtwerkes die Frage, ob diese Breite und Redundanz immer erforderlich war, um zu den genannten Ergebnissen zu gelangen.

Zum Schluß seien zwei Fragen grundsätzlicher Natur angesprochen. Zum einen: Die Ausführungen sind über weite Strecken durch Analysen der zugrunde gelegten Texte gekennzeichnet, gelangen jedoch nur selten über

(7) Vgl. etwa die "Road Map for the Journey through Volume Three" sowie den "Reminder about the Rules of the Road" in Band 3, 4-12.

diese hinaus zu einer im eigentlichen Sinn historischen Darstellung. Sie wirken deshalb mitunter eher wie die — weitgehend überzeugende — Aufbereitung des Materials für eine historische Jesusdarstellung denn wie eine solche selbst. Erst in der Interpretation, die Zusammenhänge herstellt, Lücken im Quellenmaterial füllt und auf diese Weise ein Bild von der Vergangenheit erstehen lässt, gelangt jedoch die Beschäftigung mit den Quellen zu ihrem Ziel. Die historische Jesusforschung sollte darum bei dem Entwurf eines historischen Bildes mutiger sein — eingedenk der Tatsache, dass jedes Bild der Vergangenheit eine fehlbare Konstruktion auf der Grundlage der erhaltenen Überreste ist.

Zum zweiten: Meiers “unpapal conclave” gibt Anlaß zum Nachdenken. Wird mit der Gegenüberstellung von “purely historical sources and arguments” und christologischen Überzeugungen nicht eine — gerade angesichts des Quellenbefundes — unangemessene Diastase aufgerichtet? Von den frühesten Zeugnissen an wird die Wirksamkeit Jesu durchgehend im Kontext messianischer Erwartungen des Judentums gedeutet und seine Person in eine exklusive Nähe zu Gott gerückt. Wie Meier selbst überzeugend darlegt, geschieht dies in Aufnahme des Wirkens des historischen Jesus. Angesichts dessen sollte die Gegenüberstellung von historischem Jesus und Christus des Glaubens noch einmal überdacht werden. Gründen nicht Glaubensaussagen — die zweifellos auf einer anderen Ebene liegen als historisch verifizierbare Berichte — zumindest zum Teil auch auf historischen Erfahrungen, so dass sich von daher eine strikte Trennung als brüchig erweist?

Der Verweis auf “purely historical sources and arguments” erscheint zudem klärungsbedürftig. Wie schon das Beispiel der beiden katholischen Exegeten Meier und Crossan zeigt, böte das Konsensdokument eines “unpapal conclave” keineswegs die Garantie für einen höheren Grad an “historischer Wahrheit”, denn die Möglichkeiten, mit denselben wissenschaftlichen Methoden verschiedene Bilder der historischen Person Jesu zu zeichnen, wären auch durch ein derartiges Konklave nicht aus der Welt zu schaffen. An dieser Stelle wäre deshalb eine Reflexion des erkenntnistheoretischen Status historischer Argumente notwendig.

John P. Meier hat mit diesem Band einen weiteren Teil seiner beeindruckenden Darstellung des historischen Jesus vorgelegt. Es kann kein Zweifel daran bestehen, dass diese zu den bedeutendsten Arbeiten der historischen Jesusforschung an der Wende vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert gehört und zugleich einen deutlichen Gegenentwurf zu derjenigen von John D. Crossan darstellt. Die Aufarbeitung von Quellen und Forschungsstand sowie die Reflexion der methodischen Grundlagen und angemessenen Konturen für eine Jesusdarstellung sind damit um einen Entwurf bereichert, der hohe Maßstäbe für jede künftige Diskussion setzt. Meiers Werk ist deshalb ein unverzichtbarer Beitrag zu denjenigen Fragen, die die Jesusforschung auch in Zukunft noch intensiv zu bedenken haben wird.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Susan ACKERMAN, *Warrior, Dancer, Seductress, Queen*. Women in Judges and Biblical Israel (Anchor Bible Reference Library). New York, Doubleday, 1998. xi-352 p. 16 × 24. \$36.95 – Canada \$52.95

In her introduction to this interesting and informative study, Ackerman states that the recurrent emphasis on warfare in Judges brings stereotypically to mind the world of men and their involvement in battle. Yet, she notes, the book of Judges contains much information on women characters, both named and unnamed, who then become the springboard for her further exploration of gender construction in the world of the Bible. Although Ackerman is not the first contemporary interpreter to mount a full-scale study of women in Judges, what distinguishes her work from earlier investigations is her methodological approach to understanding women in Judges from the perspective of the history-of-religions discipline. Her goal is the analysis of women in Judges and other biblical texts in the ancient Near Eastern context of Canaanite/Ugaritic forbearers. The reader is taken back to the world of the Ugaritic pantheon of El, Baal, Anat and Asherah, providing background for the worldview of the Bible and allowing the reader to glimpse the process of demythologizing these deities into the figure of Yahweh and the humans who work in consort with Yahweh in the Bible. Ackerman nicely fulfills her goal in a book that consists of six chapters preceded by an introduction and synthesized in an afterword, notes, bibliography and three indices.

Chapter 1 presents a provocative discussion of Deborah and Jael in light of the character of Anat, the warrior goddess at Ugarit, and companion to a male storm god. It proposes the evolution of Anat into the various bellicose Israelite women who are responsible for defeating Israel's enemies. Based on intricate and superb analysis of both the primary biblical data and the Ugaritic material, Ackerman posits that the Song of the Deborah depicts Deborah and Jael as Anat-like figures who complement Yahweh as divine warrior (modeled here on Baal, the rain god, who uses the forces of nature to fight) acting on Israel's behalf. With the demythologizing that occurred as ideology from the ancient Near East was recontextualized within the framework of biblical thought came the representation of Anat as woman warrior (Deborah) and as sexual seductress (Jael). This transformation is not surprising, argues Ackerman, in light of the scholarly consensus that Israelite religious beliefs incorporated and assimilated Canaanite mythology. Thus, in the course of such change, events that formerly in the Ugaritic texts took place in the divine cosmic world subsequently came to be historicized on the human earthly

plane in the Bible. The mythic-like background of the events in Judges 5 makes it possible to portray human women as warriors, contrary to normative societal expectations of gendered behavior for women.

In chap. 2, Ackerman continues to explore her captivating portrayal of Jael, turning her attention to the question of Sisera's willingness to approach Jael's tent with his guard down. She characterizes Jael as a religious functionary with whom Sisera seeks sacred sanctuary. With this interpretation, Ackerman moves from the world of mythology as background for biblical texts to matters of sociological inquiry. She accepts the theory that in times of political or religious instability or decentralization women fill roles that are otherwise denied to them in more stable times. Ackerman notes the congruity between the portrait of Jael as religious functionary in Judges 4 and 5 and argues that the historically later Judges 4, like Judges 5, came from a period of instability (the late seventh century B.C.E. for Judges 4 and the late twelfth or eleventh century B.C.E. for Judges 5) which curtailed independent public roles for women but allowed narrative depiction of women's authority in the private sphere. Ackerman also finds this willingness to ascribe cultic roles to the women of Judges in her analysis of Jephthah's daughter, Manoah's wife, and Micah's mother.

In chap. 3, Ackerman introduces further ancient Near Eastern evidence, as well as Iron-Age Hebrew epigraphic evidence from Khirbet el-Qom and Kuntillet 'Ajrud, to argue that Anat and Asherah are reflected in the image of Sisera's mother. This highly nuanced interpretation builds on emending Judg 5,30 from *šālāl*, "plunder", to *šēgāl*, "queen". In this regard, Ackerman gives significant attention to the special cultic role of the queen mother in the worship of Asherah as well as in the cult of Baal. Ackerman believes this to be especially the case in southern royal ideology, which understands Yahweh as the metaphorical father of the king. By extension, Ackerman interprets the human mother of the king as the earthy counterpart of Asherah, Yahweh's divine consort. Accordingly, Sisera's mother, as queen mother, is depicted as "the woman at the window", corresponding to the depiction of Asherah as a woman at the window.

In chap. 4, on Manoah's wife and other barren biblical women, Ackerman relies on the literary convention of type-scenes to mount her argument on the nature of motherhood and the tragedy of barrenness in biblical tradition. She ultimately proposes that the paradigm for this type-scene is informed by the Ugaritic Epic of Aqhat, arguing that the hero of the latter "in the person of Aqhat's alter ego, Pughat" (200), who defies death at the end of the text is analogous to the promised child who survives against all odds in biblical stories of barren women. Ackerman further argues for the relevance of this type-scene in the annunciation stories of Matthew and Luke, concluding that Mary is depicted both as barren woman and queen mother.

This focus on barren women and queen mothers continues in chap. 5, where the author raises the question of why barren mothers disappear from their stories but queen mothers continue to assert their authority in the texts. She notes that queen mothers achieve independence in texts primarily when they become widows — a fate that does not come to barren women depicted in the Bible. The subject of the loss of female autonomy that accompanies marriage leads Ackerman to conclude this chapter with an analysis of the

Levite's concubine, interpreted here as a secondary wife, rather than as a mistress/harem member.

Chapter 6 brings Ackerman's journey through Judges to a close by focusing on the daughters of Shiloh, whose fate ties in with the aforementioned Levite's concubine. Ackerman argues that women musicians at grape harvest festivals played a prominent role.

Ackerman is already known for her arguments that the available evidence supports claims made for the existence of the institution of queen mother in the biblical world. A considerable portion of this volume presupposes such a role in ancient Israelite society, although Ackerman qualifies this claim by positing that the role of queen mother was more prominent in Judah, based on the stability of dynastic succession, than in Israel with its basis in "charismatic" leadership. The strength of Ackerman's work — the ability to locate biblical texts in their ancient Near Eastern setting — works especially well with the figures of Deborah and Jael, but this strength may be a weakness for those who do not accept the importance of the role of queen mother in biblical Israel. Although Ackerman states that she does not assume historical reliability for the biblical tradition, she does assume that the texts make sense in the history of the tradition of biblical narratives. While Sisera's mother may or may not have been an historical queen mother, the role of queen mother made sense to ancient authors and readers. Some would disagree with this conclusion, arguing that the assumptions on which such an assertion is made are not substantiated by biblical tradition, which rarely uses the term *gēbîrâ*.

Ackerman's goal in this volume is to avoid interpreting biblical women through the lenses of either feminist condemnation of their patriarchal character or feminist claims that biblical texts can be read without a sexist interpretation. Her choice of history-of-religions methodology as a means to avoid these extremes and her concern to expose the diversity of portrayals of biblical women serves her well. Ackerman also discusses the pluralistic and complex construction of gender in the Bible in an afterword to the book. She amply demonstrates that those who want to appropriate biblical models of gender construction literally fail to appreciate the complexity — and even ambiguity — of the data on which they base such claims.

Moreover, Ackerman makes clear that despite the polemic of the Hebrew Bible against women who worshiped deities other than Yahweh, the very male-centered focus of normative biblical religion left women with few options for personal religious expression other than so-called heterodox traditions. Biblical women seized whatever possibilities for self-expression existed. On this point, biblical texts may inform contemporary notions of gender construction that emphasize self-determination. In sum, Ackerman brings much erudition to her analysis of the meaning of biblical texts in their original setting, at the same time suggesting a way to make these ancient texts relevant today. For this we should be grateful.

DePaul University  
2323 N. Seminary Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60614

Naomi STEINBERG



Andreas SCHÜLE, *Israels Sohn—Jahwes Prophet. Ein Versuch zum Verhältnis von kanonischer Theologie und Religionsgeschichte anhand der Bileam-Perikope (Num 22–24) (Altes Testament und Moderne 17)*. Münster–Hamburg–Berlin–London, LIT Verlag, 2001. 338 p. 16 × 23,5. €30,90.

The goal of this study is to examine, and where possible, to reconstruct the process by which extra-biblical material like the Balaam traditions is edited and absorbed into the biblical canon. The author presupposes, with E. Auerbach (*Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* [trans. W.R. Trask; Princeton 1953] 1-25), that “hero-formation” in Greek epic significantly parallels the process of “hero-formation” in the Bible. He also presumes that the Deir ‘Alla tradition accords Balaam more religious “legitimacy” than do its pluralistic counterparts in the Hebrew Bible (16), and, with his teachers, presumes that the finding of the Deir ‘Alla texts raises serious doubts about Balaam’s Mesopotamian origins.

Leaving aside the historical, and in particular, the sociohistorical questions (e.g., role theory), this book focuses instead on “the similarities and differences... by which the adaptation, interpretation and revision of the *Vorlagen* have left their traces on their recipients” (16). Schüle still believes that these “traces” have left not just a “still reminiscence,” but a reconstructable “reception record” (*Rezeptionsvorgang*, 20), and the purpose of his study is to “prove” (*zeigen*) that “the insertion of the Balaam pericope into the Exodus and Conquest narratives is not in the first place about the relationship between Israel and the foreign people, nor between their gods and the God of Israel, but the internal religious conflict within postexilic Israel” (20).

Thus he argues that the “central political conflict” of post-exilic Yehud is a rather bipolar division between those who stay in Judah and those who do not, and that the Balaam “tradition” (sg.) is primarily indebted to the latter of these two instead of the former. Guided by these presumptions, Schüle argues that the decision to insert the Balaam pericope where it is in the canon — before the entrance into the promised land — is *really* a decision to validate and canonize refugee concerns in post-exilic Yehud — true-vs.-false prophecy, true-vs.-false Jews, and true-vs.-false religious practice.

His argument proceeds in several concise chapters. Chapter one introduces the main thesis (cited above), while chapter two exegetes the Balaam pericope in Num 22–24, challenging and modifying W. Gross’ thesis of an originally independent pericope (*Bileam. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung der Prosa in Num 22–24* [StANT 38; München 1974] 274-288), and critically engaging H. Rouillard’s six-stage evolutionary hypothesis (*La péricope de Balaam* [Études bibliques 4; Paris 1985] 468-471). Schüle argues (against Rouillard) that Num 22–24 “does not have to do with a growing tradition” (108), and should therefore be interpreted only as a “text reacting to a specific (post-exilic) historical context”, presupposing (with Noth) that Num 22–24 is the bottom layer upon which all the other biblical Balaam references literarily depend (108). He considers no other developmental options because he believes, with his teacher E. Zenger (E.

Zenger – H.-J. Fabry – G. Braulik, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [Stuttgart 1998] 119), that “once the principles underlying the *diachronic growth* of the texts of the Israelite tradition are known, then we might also find the key (*der Schlüssel*) which explains the *canonization* of these texts” (108, emphasis original).

Chapter three breaks no new ground on the Deir ‘Alla texts, but instead adopts a number of highly-debatable epigraphical and philological positions without comment. The deity to which the *šdyn* speak in DAT 1.6, for example, is Š(amaš) instead of, say, Š(apšu) or Š(agar) — and Schüle ignores not only the ‘feminine context of the lacuna, but goes so far as to change the clear reading *šgr w‘štr* in 1.14 to *šmš w‘štr* in order to support it. In chapter four, he follows Syr, Tg. Neofiti, the fragment targums, Ps.-Philo, Philo, and Vg in translating *pētôrâ*, in Num 22,5 as “*Zeichendeuter*” (143; NRSV reads “at Pethor”), but the way he defends his position shows the limitations of his methodology. Presuming little or no history-of-tradition behind the text, he demonstrates no awareness of the attempt by Tg. Ps.-Jonathan to harmonize the geographic and the mantic interpretations of the controversial vocable *p-t-r*. Tradents do not harmonize traditions without good reasons, but Schüle’s methodology prohibits him from asking what they might be in this case. Instead, he simply notes another word-play in Num 23,14 (*šēdê šōpîm*, “*Späherfeld*”, 145), then continues in chapter 5 (a) to note that “Jacob” appears five times in the Balaam pericope (23,7.10.21; 24,17.19), (b) to hypothesize an exilic “*jacobinische Israel*” much different from the pre-exilic one on the basis of this “evidence”, and (c) to equate the two in order to visualize Balaam as a “borderline” character between “the people of God and the heathen peoples” (191).

Chapter 6 briefly examines the religiohistorical context of the Balaam traditions in order to suggest how the obviously polytheistic Deir ‘Alla tradition might be compared with the obviously monotheistic Hebrew tradition, and though the helpful monograph of Martin Beck is not mentioned (*Elia und die Monolatrie: Ein Beitrag zur religionsgeschichtlichen Rückfrage nach dem vorschriftprophetischen Jahwe-Glauben* [BZAW 281; Berlin 1999], Schüle does succeed in positioning these traditions within a plausible religiohistorical context. In chapter 7, moreover, he critically (and refreshingly) recognizes that Balaam’s “prophetic” role is lately dependent on a “tendency of legitimation” (*Tendenz der Legitimation*, 235). The most important contribution of this book is the author’s careful way of explaining how this might have occurred. John Greene addresses many of these same issues in his monograph, *Balaam and His Interpreters: A Hermeneutical History of the Balaam Traditions* (BJS 244; Atlanta 1992), but whereas Greene tries to show how Balaam plays a starring role in bipolar battles between post-exilic factions over the nature and function of “prophecy”, Schüle tries to explain the “legitimizing tendency” within monotheistic Judaism generally — and largely succeeds where Greene does not.

In short, this is a classically literary study in the Wellhausenian tradition. I have already tried to critique the shortcomings of this methodological tradition elsewhere (*The Balaam Traditions: Their Character and Development* [Atlanta 1990] 1-11), and I have suggested a sociohistorical complement to it. It is not necessary to repeat my arguments here, except to

reiterate that the classically literary approach cannot lead us to any degree of confidence about the character or development of the Balaam traditions. We simply do not have enough literary evidence for (a) alleged *Vorlagen* beneath these traditions and (b) what the precise contours and characteristics of these *Vorlagen* might be. Jeffrey Tigay addresses this problem in his monumental work, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia 1982), but his approach succeeds where Schüle's fails because the Gilgamesh tradition comes down to us in several tablets from several sites over several centuries. The same cannot be said for the Balaam traditions. All we have (so far) is a theologically conflicted Hebrew witness complemented by a highly-fragmentary plaster inscription. So we must be cautious, and developmental theories about alleged *Vorlagen* (including my own) must remain open-ended. Schüle is no doubt right to suspect a "thick network" (*dichten Netzwerk*) of "reception records" (*Rezeptionsvorgänge*) underneath Num 22–24 in its present form (17) — Mowinckel suspected as much in his 1930 article, "Der Ursprung der Bil'amsage", ZAW 48 (1930) 233–271. But no one can delineate it with any precision until or unless more hard evidence comes to light.

So, while we wait for the archaeologists, Schüle has given us an elegant, readable description of what *might* have happened when Yehud's monotheistic editors tried to legitimize these fascinating polytheistic traditions into Israel's complex sacred history.

Fuller Theological Seminary  
Phoenix, AZ 85034 – USA

Michael S. MOORE

Brevard S. CHILDS, *Isaiah. A Commentary* (The Old Testament Library). Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. xx-555 p. 15,5 × 23

The Book of Isaiah has been the subject of a surprisingly large number of commentaries recently. Within the past decade, commentaries on the whole or parts have been published by K. Baltzer, J. Blenkinsopp, P. Hanson, Y. Hoffman, J. Oswalt, C. Seitz, and M. Sweeney; further, commentaries by J. Roberts and S. Paul are soon to appear. Given this abundance, one might have thought that another commentary cannot offer genuinely new insights. Yet Brevard Childs' work addresses central questions in distinctive ways that set it apart not only from other Isaiah commentaries but other commentaries and monographs on prophetic books generally.

Childs has three main goals in this commentary. He wants to render a coherent interpretation of the text as sacred scripture, without becoming lost in methodological debates that overshadow interpretive issues. Second, he wants to relate larger hermeneutical and theological concerns addressed by biblical theologians to the close work of exegesis, since for Childs these larger concerns are ancillary to the central work of interpreting specific texts. Third, Childs accepts the value of diachronic and synchronic approaches but

deems each by itself inadequate. Consequently, he explores how they should relate to each other, arguing that by acknowledging both scholars can do justice to the unity and the diversity of scripture and to the subtle theological reflection it contains.

These goals lead Childs to provide valuable critiques of earlier scholarship, both on overarching hermeneutical issues and in regard to specific issues of method. He repeatedly discusses what he calls “retrospective reading of the prophets”, which examines how later tradents retrojected issues of their day onto earlier levels of a text. Retrospective reading can sensitize a critic to the unfolding of different voices which witness to God’s purpose for God’s people (see, e.g., 4; one hears echoes of von Rad here!). Childs shows that the attention modern scholars lavish on this sort of reading frequently obscures the theological witness of the text, because scholars limit themselves to identifying strata and locating their social or historical setting. Further, Childs intimates, many practitioners of retrospective reading are guilty of reductionism. Their investigations start from the presumption that meaning can only be understood in light of historical or sociological settings. It follows that if a pericope is the product of several layers of composition, supplementation, and redaction, the pericope simply cannot have meaning as a unit; its components can be uncovered but it cannot be read. Retrospective reading, then, prevents interpretation: what should have been a handmaiden of exegesis evolves into an end-in-itself – and also a dead end. The founder of canon criticism protests cogently throughout this commentary against this strange outcome so endemic to modern biblical scholarship. (His comments on this issue are based on his earlier article, “Retrospective Reading of the Old Testament Prophets”, *ZAW* 108 [1996] 362-377, which is helpful prior reading for anyone who intends to use the commentary).

Childs’ approach also yields important principles on more local issues. To give but one example: scholars often discount glosses added by later tradents from their interpretation. Childs, however, points out a gloss may have theological or hermeneutic value, and therefore the exegete’s task is not to remove the gloss but to read it (see, e.g., his remarks on 58 and 497). Gloss is not dross. Childs enunciates an important principle here and gives examples of how it functions meaningfully in the work of exegesis.

Simply for its ruminations on issues of method, this commentary is worth reading. Childs’ goals are an important spur for biblical scholars. By articulating these goals and setting them in the context of scholarly discussion, Childs has done the field, once again, a great service. Nonetheless, it is not clear to me that the commentary achieves these goals with any consistency. Only rarely does the commentary get around to explicating passages in their compound unity. Further, Childs’ attempts at synthesizing diachronic and synchronic methods create self-contradictions and unhappy compromises.

For Childs, a commentary that is both historical and exegetical must confront the question of how to interpret a multilayered, retrospectively edited text as an organic whole. His comments on most pericopes start with this question, reviewing and critiquing scholarship on various levels of composition and only then proceeding to a reading that respects yet moves beyond that scholarship. Three problems emerge in these discussions.

First, Childs rarely proves that the passage in question really is multilayered. To some degree this is because he builds on the work of his predecessors, but in practice this means that one cannot really join Childs in his journey through the text unless one has first read Duhm, Barth, Clements, Sweeney, Williamson, Beuken, Rendtorff, Steck and a host of others. (Much of this work is less a commentary on the Book of Isaiah than a supercommentary on earlier scholarship. This is odd for a work whose goal [see *xi*] is to provide exegesis without getting lost in methodological debates.) Readers might find helpful Childs' own discussions identifying evidence of compositional layers. Such discussions are all the more necessary given that Childs so often critiques earlier compositional analyses decisively. A few representative examples: Against some scholars, Childs argues (21-22) that the scribal addition in Isa 1,27-28 confirms rather than alters the earlier base text in vv. 21-26. This exilic supplement draws out an implication present in the original text. Childs argues that the complex text achieves an organic unity, but his reasoning could just as easily support the notion that to begin with the poem was a unity, which introduces an idea and then explores its ramifications. In any event, the interpretation of these verses is the same whether one believes that vv. 27-28 were added later or were penned by the original author, and as a result the whole discussion of multiple authorship turns out to be a red herring; it is precisely the sort of methodological debate that Childs claims he wants to avoid, because it obscures or at least delays exegesis without deepening it. Similarly, Childs reviews the debate over the question, is Isa 58,1-14 a redactional compilation of separate units or an original composition? He then writes, "If one follows the inner logic of the oracle and observes the freedom used to reshape the traditional forms of address, the discourse is fully consistent. Furthermore, a clear indication of careful redactional shaping is also revealed by the intertwining of themes by means of repetition of key words throughout the entire oracle" (476). Having shown that the passage is fully consistent, Childs has severely weakened the argument that the passage is composite. If it shows no signs of composition, why then does Childs go on to describe its "redactional shaping"? The reshaping of traditional forms of address could perfectly well be the work of a single prophet or poet. Childs critiques O. Steck's attempt to discern layers within Isa 60,1-22 according to a theory of logical consistency: "Poetic texts cannot be handled in this manner. Thus, to suggest [with Steck] that there is a conflict between building city walls and the free entry of the nations in vv. 1-9... appears excessively rationalistic and pedestrian" (494). However, Childs goes on to say in the next sentence, "Although I do not contest that the present text shows signs of growth, I question whether... such an alleged development provides the key to understanding the chapter in its final form". Well, what are the signs of growth then? Not, Childs convincingly shows us, those found by Steck, nor (it turns out in the next paragraph) those found more recently by P. Smith. All that Childs makes clear is that the text presents itself to us as a readable unity. Yet he persists in describing the text as composite. In these and many other passages, Childs displays a failure of nerve: he continues to speak of a composite text, even though he cast serious doubt on arguments for the multilayered nature of a pericope.

This problem is related to a second one: Childs rarely discusses scholars

who argue for unity within each of the two main blocks of material in the book (1–39 and 40–66). With a few minor exceptions he does not attend to the work of H. Ginsberg, J. Hayes and S. Irvine regarding 1–39. More surprisingly Childs never even refers to Y. Kaufmann, who argues in great detail that almost all of Isa 1–39 can be dated to the eighth century and that Isa 40–66 and 34–35 are the work of a single exilic author. (Kaufmann anticipated and refuted many compositional arguments which became influential later in the twentieth century and which Childs also questions.) Similarly, the reasoning C. Torrey and M. Haran regarding literary unity in 40–66 receives no attention. On occasion Childs dismisses attempts to argue for authorial unity of longer pericopes as “conservative”, but none of the scholars mentioned above are “conservative” in the sense Childs intends. (From an Orthodox Jewish or fundamentalist Christian perspective, a scholar is a heretic whether he believes in two Isaiahs or twenty.) These scholars’ arguments dovetail remarkably with the critiques of retrospective reading Childs presents. Yet Childs cannot quite free himself of the (mostly continental) models of scholarship whose foundation he himself undermines. At the same time, he avoids identifying himself with, or even citing, scholars who, while not at all conservative, might be perceived that way. As a result, he never explores an important diachronic implication of his own work: to wit, that the Book of Isaiah may be much less redactionally complex than most scholars currently believe.

Third, the structure of Childs’ comments on each passage (and also, apparently, of his reasoning process) often subverts his exegetical goal. One might have thought that a commentator who intends to read scripture as a unity (whether resulting from single authorship, redactional shaping, or serendipity) would begin his deliberations with the text in its final form and would then address compositional issues and the history of scholarship as they become relevant. Indeed, this is the model adopted by M. Greenberg in his holistic reading of Ezekiel and by J. Milgrom in his essentially canon-critical reading of P. Childs, however, begins most sections by discussing redactional shaping and reviewing earlier scholars’ retrospective readings. It is perhaps inevitable that when he moves on to the verse-by-verse exposition, he attempts to squeeze exegetical concerns into a mold shaped by the scholarship with which he began. The text in its final form ends up seeming like an afterthought, and Childs usually doesn’t quite get to where he claims to be going.

Consequently, the exegetical comments are not always as exciting as one might have hoped. Again and again we are told that a text was “carefully” crafted into a unity or that an addition was “carefully” inserted. But the nature of the care is seldom described; one could substitute “abruptly” or “capriciously”, and on the surface those adverbs would seem just as defensible. Such comments are often mere assertions, not evaluations justified by close interpretive reasoning. Similarly, Childs uses the word “intertextuality” with great frequency, but he never defines what he means by this loaded term. When Child tells us that chapter 11 “shares intertextuality with two other prophetic passages” (104), he seems simply to mean that it shares terminology with them, and the fancy word “intertextuality” adds nothing. “By careful attention to the function assigned to intertextuality

through its lengthy editorial process, one can discern a very strong force emerging that sought to unify the prophetic proclamations into a coherent composition”, we are unhelpfully informed (106). Who assigned a function to intertextuality? Childs may mean the redactor or the scribes who composed the oracle, but if so then he ought to have said “repeated vocabulary”, since “intertextuality” properly refers not to shared terminology or a compositional technique but to a type of reading or to an utterance’s use of anonymous codes making signification of meaning possible. If Childs does mean “repeated vocabulary” here, and if that vocabulary’s function was assigned by the passage’s tradents, then the pericope’s appearance of unity amounts to little; it merely results from someone throwing a few recurring words into it (or carefully incorporating them, if you prefer). Or does Childs mean that the reader assigns some function to intertextuality? If so, then the unity of the passage is the product of the reader, not of its authors, which I suspect is not what Childs means, though post-modern critics who reject diachronic analysis altogether would argue that he should mean that. In other cases Childs seems to intend the term “intertextuality” to refer to literary allusion; elsewhere, to shared vocabulary stemming from a common literary form or social setting. The differences among these phenomena are very significant for interpretation. Childs’ failure to distinguish among them is unfortunate. He does not elaborate on these features in enough detail to produce a textured exegesis, whether diachronic or synchronic in orientation.

These cases reflect a problem discussed above. Childs’ method points in one direction, but his attachment to older modes of scholarship whose relevance he successfully questions prevents him from moving decisively in that direction. Nonetheless, this commentary provides students of all prophetic books with a highly useful roadmap. Although Childs does not always depart the exegetical desert found in most twentieth century scholarship on the prophets, his voice prepares a way out from it. We are in Childs’ debt for putting us on this wise path even if we, too, sometimes stumble before fully renewing our strength.

Northwestern University  
1940 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60208-4050

Benjamin D. SOMMER

Dexter E. CALLENDER, Jr., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human* (Harvard Semitic Studies 48). Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns, 2000. xviii-244 p. \$29.95.

This monograph, a revised version of the author’s 1995 Harvard Ph.D. Dissertation, seeks to establish and examine the thematic and semantic parameters of ancient Near Eastern “primal human” traditions, i.e., traditions whose focus is a primordial human connected with the “creation, the beginning of the cosmos” and therefore belonging “to the period of the first or foundational things” (3). Thus, the book’s title is a bit misleading, for it is

not only myths about Adam, per se, that the author investigates, but biblical and other Near Eastern traditions about a primal human, of which the biblical story of Adam is just one reflection.

Comprising the bulk of the study are a number of biblical texts, which Callender argues, either directly or indirectly reflect such traditions. These texts are organized into the first three major sections of the book as follows: Gen 1–3 (Part I: Direct Attestations: Narratives about the Primal Human); Ezek 28,11-19 and Job 15,7-16 (Part II: Indirect Attestations: The Primal Human as Analogy); and Ezek 28,1-10, Prov 8,22-31, and a brief discussion of primal human imagery in the stories of Cain and Noah (Part III: Vestigial Allusions: The Sublimation of Primal Human Imagery). Evidence from the Psalms (8,82) also is considered briefly, especially in the first two chapters. Each of these texts are mined for philological insights relevant to the topic and examined in the light of extra-biblical materials including, *inter alia*, the Adapa myth and other Mesopotamian *apkallu*-traditions, the Gilgamesh Epic, a number of Ugaritic texts, and several apocryphal and pseudepigraphic works.

Of particular focus in the book's first three sections are three characteristic *topoi*, which Callender sees as shared among the various primal human traditions: location, wisdom, and conflict. The first of these, Callender suggests, can be best seen in Gen 2–3, Ezek 28, and Job 15 which place the locus of the primal human's activity in the Garden of Eden, "the garden of God", and "the council of God", respectively. The *topos* of wisdom also appears to be a concern in these chapters, as the tree of knowledge in Gen 2–3 makes most apparent. The conflict *topos* is evident in the expulsion of the primal human from the garden in both Gen 3 and Ezek 28, and perhaps also in the somewhat ambiguous act of hubris expressed in Job 15,8 and 15,15. Combined, these *topoi* present a rather unique intermediary status of the primal human in Israelite mythology. According to Callender, "The primal human alone is not 'born of woman'. He is the only one whose natural state was face to face with God. He is the only one who lived in the 'actual' (mythical) divine dwelling. Others can perform the function of intermediary, but in doing so they but mimetically follow the primal human. In this sense the primal human is the significant ancestor who established the paradigm for contact with the divine" (206-207).

The paradigmatic and intermediary character of the primal human, Callender suggests, can be seen in the language used to describe him which casts him as a royal figure (Gen 1,26-28), a priest (Ezek 28,11-19), and a prophet (Job 15,7-8). As a royal figure, the primal human is the gardener of the divine garden (seen here also as an archetype for the temple [50-54]) and the shepherd of his people. As a priest, he is endowed with "divine and sacral attributes at his creation. He is distinguished by his possessing the stones of the high priest breastpiece, an instrument of divination" (210). The primal human as prophet attends the assembly of God and tends to his word. He might even be "numbered among the 'sons of God'" (213). As such, the primal human also acts as a "culture-bearer, a figure who brings divine knowledge to humanity" (200).

Many of the aforementioned attributes of the primal human have been noted before by others, albeit in disparate publications, and in very different contexts. Where Callender breaks new ground, however, is in his



understanding of how these *topoi* functioned. As he argues, they served to communicate a “coherent set of ideas, which constituted a symbol that was recognized by the ancients”, a “symbol (that) functioned in each of its literary contexts, to forge an understanding of its various manifestations and permutations” (15). Thus, Callender is less interested in how the biblical writers employed primal human traditions for literary or rhetorical effect (though this is discussed periodically), and more interested in how such traditions constituted “just a part of the system of symbols that comprised ancient Israel’s ever-evolving cultural system” (17). As such, the primal human *topoi* may be seen as tools for exploring and defining the boundaries between mortals and God in ancient Israel.

According to Callender, we may ascertain how this exploration and definition took place by recognizing the paradigmatic nature of primal human traditions as “the basis for the ‘mythical mode’ behind the rituals of intermediaries” (213). “As such — he states — the primal human conception emerges as a paradigm for intermediary figures in ancient Israelite society. It provided at least one stream of tradition in the construction and regulation of ideas concerning kingship and other offices of intermediation” (206). Given that biblical texts portray the primal human in both positive and negative terms, Callender opines that these traditions probably served to legitimate, while placing in check, the authoritative activities of Israel’s intermediary kings, priests, and prophets.

This is an interesting and useful study, and certainly the first to make sense of Israelite primal human traditions by drawing on the methodologies of scholars working in the comparative study of religions, especially those of M. Eliade, A. van Gennep, and V. Turner. Some might disagree with Callender’s interpretation of particular biblical verses, especially of difficult lines that have mystified exegetes for centuries (e.g., Callender’s treatment of *hōtem toknît* [Ezek 28,12] in the light of Gen 1,26 as a reference to God as the “model” for creating Adam). Others might question whether Callender, at times, is reading primal human traditions *into* the evidence (e.g., he suggests that Prov 8,22-31 offers a “greatly sublimated” reflection of the tradition [193]). One might even question to what degree the primal human traditions discussed in the book can be seen to represent comparable variations of a shared Near Eastern mythology, rather than completely unrelated traditions with shared features. Indeed, Callender nowhere clarifies or justifies his methodological position in this regard. Such criticisms notwithstanding, Callender’s study offers a number of insights precisely because it moves boldly beyond the purely descriptive mode that characterizes much of biblical scholarship.

Thus the book also provides a useful model for future comparative and expanded treatments of the topic. One could envision, for example, an investigation of primal human traditions in ancient Egypt that includes visual and textual references to the god Khnum creating kings on a potter’s wheels. In Egypt too we find references to pharaoh as gardener of the divine garden and shepherd of his people (comparative material notably absent in Callender’s discussion of these *topoi* [207-209]). One also could imagine a comparative treatment of later Talmudic and midrashic, as well as Islamic traditions concerning Adam. Such studies would shed light on the pervasiveness and longevity of primal human traditions and would help to

establish even more broadly the historical and thematic parameters of Near Eastern primal human mythologies. Future comparative studies such as these will doubtless find Callender's book a useful point of departure.

University of Washington  
Box 353120  
Seattle, Washington 98195-3120

Scott B. NOEGEL

### Novum Testamentum

Barbara SHELLARD, *New Light on Luke*. Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Content (JSNTSS 215). London – New York, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 2002. 340 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

Barbara Shellard's monograph revives interest in source criticism by presenting a new interpretation of the relation of Luke to the other three canonical Gospels. She concludes that Luke is the "fourth evangelist" (chronologically; cf. 276) and used Mark, Matthew, and John as sources. These sources are used in different ways by the author of Luke. "Mark's was the Gospel he knew best and valued most; his reaction to Matthew and John was much more critical and his use of them accordingly more sparing and hence less immediately apparent" (288). From her discussion of Lukan sources, Shellard draws conclusions about the purpose of this Gospel. It is a "corrective Gospel" (261) and to some extent it also wishes "to reconcile differing streams" (289). The conclusions about purpose are less innovative than the discussion of sources.

Shellard believes that Mark is the earliest Gospel and was used by both Matthew and Luke. She rejects the Q hypothesis, since she believes that the so-called Q material in Luke is derived directly from Matthew. In Chap. 1 Shellard discusses the date of Luke-Acts, which she puts at about 100 CE (cf. 23-34). She advances one unusual argument for this date; she asserts that Luke knew the writings of Josephus, including *Jewish Antiquities* (cf. 31-34).

Chap. 2 is entitled "The Nature of Luke's Intended Audience". I find this title to be inappropriate, for the actual content of the chapter is a discussion of the ways that Luke-Acts presents various groups in the narrative: Romans, Jews and God-fearers, and Christians. One should not assume that one can move easily and effortlessly from descriptions of groups in a narrative about the past to conclusions about the intended audience of a narrative at the time it was written. Some arguments in this chapter show, in my opinion, a limited understanding of Luke's perspective and concerns. She believes that Luke "plays down the kingship motif" (39, n. 10), ignoring the central place of the proclamation of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah in prominent scenes and statements by authoritative interpreters (persons that I have elsewhere called

"reliable characters"). We find this proclamation in the mouth of a direct messenger from God at the beginning of Luke (Luke 1,32-33) and in the primary sermons to Jews by Peter and Paul in Acts (Acts 2,30-31.36; 13,22-23.32-37), as well as other places. I believe that recent narrative criticism of Luke-Acts provides a more sophisticated and penetrating interpretation of the "ideology" of Luke-Acts, which would have been useful even for Shellard's work in source criticism. This point also applies to her comments about Luke's attitude toward the Jewish people, which, she says, is "complex" and, in the view of many, "fundamentally inconsistent" (46). One may agree that the matter is complex, but progress in understanding requires us to recognize that we are dealing with a narrative in which events make a difference. Changes take place, which result not in inconsistency but development, and the narrative may highlight, as part of its message, a lingering tragic tension between possibility and present circumstance.

The most extensive and important section of Shellard's book focuses on the relation of Luke to Matthew and to John. In Chap. 3 she discusses Luke and Matthew in relation to the synoptic problem. Her conclusion is cautious, for she admits that neither the hypothesis that Luke used Matthew nor the Q hypothesis can be proved. However, she adds that "a simple theory which involves an extant source in fairly wide circulation at the end of the first century... is to be preferred to one relying on a hypothetical document such as Q" (84). This is not a compelling argument. It is true that the simpler hypothesis is to be preferred in some disciplines, but historical circumstances are often more complex than our hypotheses. Shellard also minimizes the importance of the issue by stating that "Luke's purpose as revealed by his treatment of his sources... would be the same whether that source were Matthew or the hypothetical 'Q'" (84). This, I believe, is a hasty statement, for the outcome of the debate does make a difference in appropriate methodology. If Luke used Matthew, we have direct access to Luke's source and we know who is responsible for any changes. If both Matthew and Luke used Q, we have the additional burden of deciding which of the two evangelists (if not both) is responsible for changes.

Although she concedes that neither hypothesis can be proven, Shellard presents detailed arguments to show that it is reasonable to conclude that Luke used Matthew rather than Q. She points to the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke in contrast to Mark in material that they share with Mark. This is, in fact, the strongest evidence of a direct literary relation between Matthew and Luke. Most space, however, is devoted to the difficult task of explaining how Lukan texts could be derived from Matthew in material that they alone share. In Chap. 3 she discusses some of these texts in the earlier part of Luke. Chapters 4 and 5 are devoted to "Luke's Central Section" (Luke 9,51-19,27), which requires special attention because of extensive use of non-Markan material. Some of the general comments on Luke's redaction include: Luke dislikes long blocks of teaching, as found in Matthew (65; yet there is a long discourse in Luke 15,1-17,10 segmented, to be sure, by shifts in the addressees); when Luke finds two conflicting versions, he often freely rewrites and relocates (70); some of Matthew's sayings are turned into narratives, including parables (82; but here the connection may be tenuous).

A number of Shellard's explanations of specific passages are possible.

Thus Luke's beatitudes, often assumed to be more original than Matthew's, do reflect Luke's emphasis on the poor, and it is possible, perhaps, that Luke's sermon on the plain is purposeful redaction of the sermon on the mount in order to make the sermon focus more clearly on love of enemies (78-79, 82-83). It is difficult to reach sound decisions in these matters because we have a surplus of possible explanations and a dearth of decisive evidence. That is, it is possible to propose various explanations of redactional purpose in an attempt to justify different and conflicting hypotheses, while the evidence in texts is not sufficient to move discussion beyond the hypothetical. Shellard recognizes that she has not been able to prove that Luke has used Matthew as a source. In light of the history of New Testament studies, it would still be an accomplishment to convince others that her view is a strong possibility. This is what Shellard attempts to do. Some of her proposals are more attractive than others, and she leaves many unanswered questions, such as why Luke would transform Matthew's brief prayer (the Lord's Prayer, Matt 6,9-13) into a still briefer prayer in Luke 11,2-4, and why the woes in Matt 23, which are "clear and coherent, reaching a fitting and impressive climax", are transformed by Luke into a version with "no central unifying theme..., and his conclusion, far from forming a climax, is limp and abrupt" (104-105; cf. Luke 11,37-52).

Chap. 6 discusses "Luke and the Johannine Tradition: Common Ideas and Themes". The themes are general ones and link Luke with Revelation, as well as the Gospel of John. In this chapter Shellard is not arguing for a literary relationship, so the discussion here stands somewhat apart from the main line of argument.

In Chap. 7 she does argue for a literary relationship between Luke and John, with Luke dependent on John for certain features that distinguish Luke from the other synoptic Gospels. There are some intriguing similarities of narrative detail in Lukan and Johannine stories that otherwise seem quite independent. The situation is puzzling, for the specificity of some of the agreements would seem to support a literary relationship, while the limited and sporadic appearance of these agreements would seem to argue against it. The largest concentration of agreements is in the passion and resurrection narratives.

If there is a literary relationship, it is often impossible to be sure which version came first, as Shellard recognizes (215). However, she believes that the "assumption of Lukan priority... rests on very shaky foundations", for it is possible to argue that Luke is consistently dependent on John (215). She does admit, however, that in one case (Luke 22,3; John 13,27) there is some evidence that Luke is prior (240-242).

Shellard rests much of her case for Johannine priority on three pericopes, the anointing of Jesus by a woman, Jesus' appearance before Jewish authorities and Peter's denial, and the resurrection narratives (243). In the first of these (Luke 7,36-50; John 12,1-8) Luke and John share the striking detail that a woman anointed Jesus' feet and wiped them with her hair. Yet in most respects the stories are quite different. Shellard argues that "inconsistencies in Luke" (245) show that Luke's account is secondary, but I find her arguments to be weak. The claim that tears would not be sufficient to wet Jesus' feet assumes that we are dealing with realistically accurate rather than dramatized

stories. That the reference to hair in Luke 7,44 “unbalances” the sentence assumes that the author is, or should be, striving for a rigid repetitive structure in 7,44-46. There is no need for this assumption. The agreements between Luke and John in the passion story deserve careful study, but, again, Shellard’s assertion that there are inconsistencies in Luke’s account of the appearance before the High Priest appears to me to be dubious. She says, for instance, that it is highly improbable that the whole council would speak as one, as reported in Luke 22,70 (249). Again, this remark fails to recognize that we are dealing with simplified and dramatized narrative. It does not serve the author’s purpose to report individually what each person said.

According to Shellard, “the connections between Luke and John are strongest in their Resurrection narratives” (251). However, the Lukan text also presents us with a special problem. The three Lukan verses that show the most striking relation to John (Luke 24,12; John 20,3-8; Luke 24,36; John 20,19,26; Luke 24,40; John 20,20) are completely or partially lacking in *Codex Bezae* and Old Latin manuscripts. In discussing this issue Shellard points to the weight of manuscript evidence for inclusion (257). In spite of this, it is appropriate to ask why some manuscripts would omit all three of the most striking agreements with John. This could hardly be unintentional. An explanation in defense of *Codex Bezae* is easy. A scribe, remembering John, wanted to complete the story to his satisfaction. This consideration may not be sufficient to overturn the strong manuscript evidence for inclusion, but it shows that the issue is more difficult to resolve than Shellard recognizes.

Shellard argues with vigor and detail for a minority position on Gospel relationships. She is not able to answer all the objections to her position and may not convince many who do not already accept her views. But she makes a valuable contribution to New Testament studies by showing that some long-settled issues are not so settled as we thought.

960 Braumiller Rd.  
Delaware, OH 43015, USA

Robert C. TANNEHILL

Susanne RUSCHMANN, *Maria von Magdala im Johannesevangelium. Jüngerin – Zeugin – Lebensbotin* (NTAbh 40). Münster, Aschendorff, 2002. ix-269 p. 15,5 × 23. €38,90

In recent years there have been a number of studies of the roles of women, including Mary Magdalene, in the Fourth Gospel, just as there have also been a number of studies, both popular and scholarly, of Mary Magdalene herself in early Christianity or in later tradition. In this 2001 Dissertation for the Theology Faculty at Albert-Ludwigs University, Freiburg, Susanne Ruschmann offers the first book-length analysis of the role of Mary within the framework of the theology of the Fourth Gospel. (Ruschmann does not appear to know I.R. Kitzberger, “Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala - Two Female Characters in the Johannine Passion Narrative: A Feminist Narrative-Critical Reader-Response”, *NTS* 41 [1995] 564-586). The subtitle of the book

summarizes its conclusions – in an exemplary way Mary fulfils the three roles that are cardinal for the ideal response to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel; she is disciple, witness, and one who passes on to others the life-giving message. Despite this introduction and the expectations that might be provoked by the book's title, this is not a feminist analysis in method or in presuppositions; some will see this as a virtue, re-integrating the women of Scripture into main-line study, although, as we shall see later, the analysis could have been enhanced by some interaction with studies adopting a more overt feminist perspective.

Ruschmann's method is that of '*relecture*', as modelled most notably by A. Dettwiler, K. Scholtissek, and J. Zumstein; this she presents both as a process within the text and as a hermeneutical method, with the method to some extent retracing the process. As method, *relecture* combines diachronic and synchronic modes of analysis: diachronically it operates historically-critically, investigating the earlier roots and development of the tradition, including the redactional work of the author; synchronically it looks within the text for recurring patterns of structure and language which may invite an interactive exegesis. As textual process, the Fourth Gospel and Johannine theology are understood as the result of a multi-layered pattern of tradition and its reworking; however, in deliberate opposition to theories which understand this process as marked by conflict and reaction (e.g. G. Richter, J. Becker), here the key words are 'organic', 'continuity', '*Fortschreibung*'. This integrated hermeneutic is more a starting point than a conclusion reached by thorough analysis; it seeks to combine the insights of the older source-critical style of literary analysis with those of more recent narrative criticism. Yet it does so not just on literary grounds but under the mantle of a theological understanding of the '*nachösterliche Sich-Erinnern der Glaubenden*' which is the work of the Paraclete and/ or of the Risen Christ's self-revelation within the community (or Johannine School). The method is an attractive one, leading to a holistic reading which takes seriously the final form of the text but which escapes the theological naiveté of some literary analyses; yet this, too, will prompt a further question later.

The basic methodological principle is worked out in the structure of the book. Besides an account of the method, the introductory section also includes a cautious discussion of the familiar issues of redaction and community context, as well as a statement of the theme of the Gospel as consisting in the decision for Jesus (represented, albeit imperfectly, by the disciples) or against him. The second section then undertakes the diachronic task, tracing what is known about Magdala and about the women around Jesus, here reflecting the influence of the work of G. Theissen; the Synoptic accounts of Mary; and the traditio-historical issues surrounding John 19,25 and 20,1-18. In this account there is a tendency to treat the Synoptics as a single source with limited regard to the redactional differences between them; the initial 'historical' analysis also asks few questions about the reliability of the Synoptics, and is perhaps over-dependent on secondary literature, including Strack-Billerbeck. The analysis of the Johannine pericopae first presents the internal problems of the text, then discusses the relevant scholarly solutions, before proposing the one adopted here, on which basis there follows an exegesis of the passage. This leads to a high degree of

repetition, for example the unexpected plural 'we do not know' (20,2) or Jesus's enigmatic 'I am ascending' (20,17) have to be considered at each stage of this process.

The third, and longest, section undertakes a synchronic analysis. Here, John 19,25 is fairly swiftly dealt with; Ruschmann accepts with little critical analysis that the episode in 19,24 establishes the *nova familia dei*, and that by her presence Mary of Magdala is incorporated into that new family. Hence she belongs to Jesus's 'own' in two senses, before and after 'Easter', as one who was there at his death and for whom Jesus died, and as one who belonged to the new family created by his death. Although the creation of that new family is a common interpretation of John 19,24, it is not without its problems, and Ruschmann's development of it with regard to Mary needs to be justified more thoroughly. Why do we hear no more of the mother of Jesus? How does the Beloved Disciple's constitutive membership of that new family impact on the interpretation of 20,3-10? What of the other women?

However, it is 20,1.2.11-18 which Ruschmann finds most productive. For this she draws on K. Scholtissek's earlier work ("«Mitten unter euch steht er, den ihr nicht kennt» (Joh 1,26)", *MTZ* 48 [1997] 103-127), and, on the basis of a similar vocabulary set and structure, presents the Mary pericope as an internal or 'synoptic' (*re*)lecture of the call of the disciples in 1,35-51. Ruschmann highlights effectively the parallels in the themes of seeking, being summoned, and passing on the message to others, but while the shared language of 'what/ whom do you seek' (1,38; 20,15) does support her case, that of 'ascend' (1,51; 20,17) or 'turn' (in 1,38 of Jesus; in 20,14.16 of Mary) does not obviously carry the interpretative and theological weight that they are being given; here there is a danger that a fruitful insight is being pushed further than it can go.

A second synoptic reading is with 13,31-14,31, particularly with 14,18-24. Here Ruschmann admits that there are no compelling linguistic or structural markers to support the choice — the attempt to correlate the  $\pi\omicron\upsilon$  of 20,2.13.15 with the  $\pi\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$  which undergirds chapter 14 only underlines the problem. Instead she presupposes that the 'coming' predicted in the first Farewell Discourse must anticipate the resurrection 'coming' of Jesus, which takes narrative form in chapter 20. This is in line with the principle behind *relecture* noted above that the different levels of tradition are harmonious with each other. Yet to question this is not to undermine the richness of Johannine thought; indeed, might not this assumption of a fairly straightforward correlation between the two passages lead to a flattening of the potentially creative tensions within the Gospel? If we allow for a real ambiguity in the 'coming' of 14,19-23, then may not this chapter subvert even while anticipating the resurrection narratives of chapter 20? For example, does interpreting 20,17 by 14,20 (219-220) absolve too readily the former of any difficulty? Need the search for an organic Johannine theology demand the absence of any tension if not conflict? It is precisely questions such as these that have surfaced again and again in Johannine study, and that too simplistic an understanding of *relecture* may cover over.

The final part of this third section examines the role of Mary within the framework of the Gospel. She is one of Jesus's 'own' (cf. 10,3.5); she is a disciple, which is established not by the term  $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ , which is not directly

used of her, but by the relationship with 1,35-51, and by her implied (?) inclusion in the disciples of 20,19; she is a witness (again, despite John's failure to use this term) and shares in the confession of 20,25; and she is a messenger. Since she also belongs to the new family of God, to whom Jesus refers as his ἀδελφοί (20,17), she counts as child of God and 'sister' of Jesus. Ruschmann also presents her as 'beloved' through an interesting discussion of the echoes of the Song of Songs in 20,14-18, although she probably dismisses too easily the erotic elements in that text and the gender implications of its use. These characteristics lead into a comparison between Mary and the other disciples, particularly the beloved disciple and Thomas; she emerges as a counterpart of the former, one who embodies within a narrative the move from pre-Easter to post-Easter discipleship of Jesus. In contrast to the more statically pictured 'beloved disciple', she offers a dynamic model so that readers might identify with her and undertake her journey. Finally, since the community is established through 'remembering', Mary Magdalene becomes a '*johanneische Erinnerungsfigur*' enabling those who share her journey to hold together present and past in true continuity.

Although this last part of the discussion repeatedly speaks of Mary's 'narrative' function, the discussion tends to subordinate the narrative detail to a theological meaning provided by the discursive parts of the Gospel: echoing older understandings of the structure of the Gospel, 20,1-18 functions as the 'sign' whose meaning is provided by the 'discourse' of chapter 14. Clearly this raises very important hermeneutical questions: how is such a reading to be tested and validated so that it does not slip into a homiletic rather than a strictly exegetical exercise? Without the mediation of 14,18-24 much of Ruschmann's argument would fall. Yet the Evangelist chose the narrative Gospel format for his work, and recent narrative criticism, for all its limitations, has drawn attention to the intrinsic narrative skills he displays; are we right to make the characters he introduces theological ciphers with paradigmatic roles? In Mary's case, this can only be achieved by reading much more into the simple reference in 19,25 than that verse may be able to carry. Are we not bound to ask, 'If this is what the Evangelist meant his readers to understand, was this the best way for him to do it? Could he not have made a clearer case?' A more narrative-focused reading of the Gospel might have chosen one of the other women-stories (Chapter 4 or 11) to interact with, although this might count as *relecture* more as a hermeneutical exercise than as internal textual process. The parity of reference to these other women is in fact surprising. Like many theses, Ruschmann is better at offering an interpretation than at asking those self-critical questions which might test it.

Yet these are criticisms provoked by a tightly argued and consistently thought through argument. *Maria von Magdala im Johannesevangelium* will make a significant contribution to future discussion of the roles of women in the Fourth Gospel, and to the now vigorous debate about an appropriate hermeneutic for its understanding.

Department of Theology and Religious Studies  
King's College London,  
Strand, London WC2R 2LS

Judith LIEU



# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

**R. P. José O'Callaghan, S. J.**

*In memoriam*

On December 15, 2001, Emeritus Prof. Fr. José O'Callaghan, S. J., died in the Jesuit infirmary at San Cugat del Vallés (Barcelona) after a lengthy illness caused by diabetes complications. Fr. O'Callaghan was born in Tortosa, Spain, on October 7, 1922. He entered the Society of Jesus on October 29, 1940 and was ordained to the priesthood on May 31, 1952. In 1953, he obtained a Licentiate in Theology from the Theological Faculty of San Cugat del Vallés, and then a Doctorate in Philosophy and Letters from the University of Madrid in 1959 with the thesis entitled *Las tres categorías estéticas de la cultura clásica* (Madrid 1960). He continued his studies at the University of Milan, where he studied under the famous papyrologist Prof. Orsolina Montevicchi, and obtained a Doctorate in Classical Letters in 1960, with the thesis *Cartas cristianas griegas del siglo V* (Barcelona 1963).

Fr. O'Callaghan taught at the Theological Faculty of San Cugat del Vallés from 1961 to 1971. During that time, he founded the Papyrology Seminar there, which he continued to direct throughout his active academic life. Thanks to the generosity of his brother-in-law, Josep Palau Ribes, Fr. O'Callaghan was able to purchase a large number of papyri and to found a periodical, *Studia Papirologica*, as well as two series of publications, "Papyrologica Castroctaviana" and "Estudis de Papirologia i Filologia Bíblica".

In 1962, Fr. O'Callaghan began teaching biblical Greek at the Theology Faculty of San Cugat del Vallés. He was called to Rome in 1971 to teach papyrology at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, where he remained until his retirement at the age of seventy in 1992. He was dean of the Biblical Faculty from 1983 to 1986. During his tenure in Rome, he also taught as a visiting professor at the University of Urbino.

In 1972, Fr. O'Callaghan excited the academic world with his suggestion that, among the Greek texts from Cave 7 of Qumran, one of them (7Q5) was to be identified as a fragment of the Gospel of Mark (¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?", *Bib* 53 [1972] 91-100). If true, such a discovery would determine an early date for the composition of the gospel, around AD 50. Based on this identification, he suggested the possibility that other fragments from Cave 7 may be New

Testament texts as well. After having launched his proposal, Fr. O'Callaghan maintained a scholarly and gentlemanly distance from the extended, and occasionally acrimonious, debate that followed.

While a student of philosophy at Sarrià (Barcelona), he encountered Fr. José Maria Bover, SJ, who was engaged in the preparation of a critical edition of the Greek New Testament and who first introduced Fr. O'Callaghan to the discipline of textual criticism. Fr. O'Callaghan became a collaborator of Bover, and published his *Nuevo Testamento Trilingüe* (BAC; Madrid 1977), as well as introductions to textual criticism in Catalan and in Spanish. Based on his early work with Bover, as well as his own research in papyrology, Fr. O'Callaghan was the author of numerous writings in the areas of papyrology and classical and New Testament philology. Throughout his active years he maintained a close relationship with many colleagues in his field.

In addition to his scholarly pursuits, Fr. O'Callaghan found time for pastoral activity, both in Rome and in Spain. The memory that Fr. O'Callaghan leaves behind is one of a dedicated priest and scholar, as well as of a kind and jovial companion.

Stephen Pisano, SJ

**R.P. John Joseph Welch, S.J.***In memoriam*

Il P. John Joseph Welch, professore al Biblico dal 1972 al 1991, si è spento improvvisamente a Roma il 14 gennaio 2002, all'età di 77 anni. Originario di Kansas City, Missouri, entrò a 17 anni nella Compagnia di Gesù, compiendovi l'abituale percorso di formazione fino al sacerdozio. Orientato presto all'insegnamento del latino e del greco, completò il suo tirocinio con il Dottorato in lingue classiche e in linguistica presso l'Università di Philadelphia nel 1962. Dopo aver insegnato lingue classiche all'Università di St. Louis, venne chiamato al Pontificio Istituto Biblico per sostituire il P. Maximilian Zerwick giunto all'emeritato.

Pur assumendo come base dei suoi Corsi il manuale *Graecitas Biblica* del suo predecessore, il P. Welch si caratterizzò per un approccio alla lingua greca (del Nuovo Testamento e della LXX) più consono alle esigenze della linguistica contemporanea; critico nei confronti di presunti assiomi della grammatica tradizionale (in particolare, sull'aspetto del verbo greco), propugnava un'interpretazione linguistica più attenta alle sfumature desumibili dal contesto. Eccelleva nei contatti personali e nei piccoli gruppi di Seminario, dove la cordialità dei rapporti stimolava la sua acuta sensibilità filologica e letteraria.

Poco incline ad assumere iniziative di ricerca personale in vista di pubblicazioni, si rese disponibile a collaborare con altri, Docenti e Laureandi, sia per indagini in campo filologico, sia per la redazione di Dissertazioni in lingua inglese, dove egli metteva a frutto la sua squisita cultura letteraria, coltivata regolarmente anche mediante gruppi di lettura guidata.

L'attività pastorale aveva costantemente accompagnato il suo insegnamento, e si era sviluppata negli ultimi anni. Coloro che dal P. Welch sono stati aiutati personalmente conservano un vivo ricordo della sua finezza d'animo e della sua fedele amicizia.

Pietro Bovati

**Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense**

July 23-25, 2002

The 52nd annual meeting of the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* will be held at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, on July 23-25, 2003. The theme of the conference is "The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition".

Proposals for Short Papers (20 min.) should be submitted to the President before March 15, 2003:

Prof. J. Schlosser  
28 rue Gounod  
F-67000 Strasbourg  
Fax: (0)3 88615708  
E-mail: [jacques.schlosser@noos.fr](mailto:jacques.schlosser@noos.fr)

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Tutti i libri o i fascicoli che vengono inviati alla Direzione appaiono in questo elenco. Il fatto che vi figurino non implica alcun giudizio su di essi. Recensioni più ampie dei libri verranno fatte secondo il parere del Redattore.

I libri inviati alla Direzione che non sono stati chiesti direttamente per recensione non si restituiscono in nessun caso, anche se non potranno essere recensiti. Tutti i libri insieme con gli estratti di articoli inviati alla Direzione vengono trasmessi all'Editore dell' *Elenchus of Biblica* e vi appariranno secondo il giudizio dell'Editore.

I libri vanno inviati alla "Direzione di *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Via della Pilotta, 25 – I-00187 Roma – Italia".

**Roddy**, Nicolae, *The Romanian Version of the Testament of Abraham*. Text, Translation, and Cultural Context (Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 19). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. x-140 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.95

**Ronchi**, Ermes Maria, *Bibbia e pietà mariana*. Presenze di Maria nella Scrittura (Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 1.8). Brescia, Queriniana Editrice, 2002. 136 p. 13,5 × 21. €9,00

**Ross**, Alan p., *Introducing Biblical Hebrew*, Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 2001. 565 p. 18 × 26. \$39.99

**Rowland**, Christopher, *Christian Origins*. The Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism. Second Edition. London, SPCK, 2002. xxvi-451 p. 15,5 × 23. £22.50

**Runesson**, Anders, *The Origins of the Synagogue*. A Socio-Historical Study (ConB New Testament Series 37). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001. 573 p. 15,5 × 23. SEK. 366,-

**Ruppert**, Lothar, *Genesis*. Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar. 2. Teilband: Gen 11,27–25,18 (FzB 98). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 2002. 657 p. 15,5 × 23. €36,80 – SFr 65,50

**Ruschmann**, Susanne, *Maria von Magdala im Johannesevangelium*. Jüngerin – Zeugin – Lebensbotin (NTAbh 40). Münster, Aschendorff, 2002. ix-269 p. 15,5 × 23. €38,90

**Samely**, Alexander, *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah*. Oxford, University Press, 2002. xi-481 p. 14 × 22. £55.00

**Sassoon**, Isaac S. D., *Destination Torah*. Notes and Reflections on Selected Verses from the Weekly Torah Readings. Hoboken, Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 2001. xvii-364 p. 16 × 23,5. \$29.50

**Schaefer**, Conrad, O. S. B., *Psalms* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry). A Michael Glazier Book. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2001. xlv-399 p. 16 × 23,5. \$49.95

**Schrage**, Wolfgang, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 4. Teilband (1Kor 15,1–16,24) (EKKNT VII/4). Düsseldorf, Benziger Verlag – Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 2001. viii-484 p. 16,5 × 24. DM 149 – ÖS 1088 – SFr 131.00

**Schüle**, Andreas, *Israels Sohn – Jahwes Prophet*. Ein Versuch zum Verhältnis von kanonischer Theologie und Religionsgeschichte anhand der Bileam-Perikope (Num 22-24) (Altes Testament und Moderne 17). Münster – Hamburg – Berlin – London, Lit Verlag, 2001. 338 p. 16 × 23,5. €30,90

**Schwartz**, Max, *The Biblical Engineer*. How the Temple in Jerusalem was Built. Hoboken, N. J., KTAV Publishing House, 2002. xxv-166 p. 21,5 × 28. Hardcover: \$29.50 – paperback: \$17.95

**Sharon**, Diane M., *Patterns of Destiny*. Narrative Structures of Foundation and Doom in the Hebrew Bible. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2002. xii-244 p. 15, 5 × 23,5. \$29.50

**Shellard**, Barbara, *New Light on Luke*. Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Content (JSNTSS 215). London – New York, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 2002. 340 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

**Silberman**, Neil Asher – **Frerichs**, Ernest S. (eds.), *Archaeology and Society in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Case Studies. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society and the Dorot Foundation, 2001. vi-210 p. 17 × 24,5. \$28.00

**Simian-Yofre**, Horacio (ed.), *Metodología del antiguo testamento* (Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 106). Salamanca, Ediciones Sígueme, 2001. 249 p. 13 × 21

**Sirat**, Colette, *Hebrew Manuscripts of the Middle Ages*. Edited and translated by Nicholas de Lange. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvi-349 p. 18 × 25,5

**Smith**, Mark S., *Untold Stories*. The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2001. xix-252 p. 16 × 23,5

**Soggin**, J. Alberto, *Storia d'Israele*. Introduzione alla storia d'Israele e Giuda dalle origini alla rivolta di Bar Kochbà (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 44). Seconda edizione interamente rifatta e aggiornata. Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2002. 525 p. 15 × 21. €37,00

**Son**, Sang-Won (Aaron), *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology*. A study of selected terms, idioms, and concepts in the light of Paul's usage and background (AnBib 148). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001. xvii-240 p. 16,5 × 24. €15,49 – \$17.50

**Stern**, Sacha, *Calendar and Community*. A History of the Jewish Calendar Second Century BCE–Tenth Century CE. Oxford, University Press, 2001. xvi-306 p. 16 × 24. £45.00

**Stiebert**, Johanna, *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible*. The Prophetic Contribution (JSOTSS 346). London – New York, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 2002. x-196 p. 16 × 24. £50.00

**Stock**, Klemens, S.J., *La Liturgia della Parola*, Spiegazione dei Vangeli domenicali e festivi: Anno A (Matteo) (Bibbia e Preghiera 39). Roma, Edizioni ADP, 2001. 359 p. 14 × 21. €12,40 – Lit. 24.000

**Stone**, Michael E., *Adam's Contract with Satan*. The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam. Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 2002. xvii-195 p. 16 × 23,5. \$39.95

**Tábet**, Michelangelo, *Introduzione al Pentateuco e ai Libri Storici dell'Antico Testamento*. Manuale di Sacra Scrittura (Sussidi di Teologia). Apollinare Studi, Roma, 2001. 401 p. 17 × 24. €25,82 – Lit. 50.000

**Talshir**, Zipora, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary* (SBLSCS 50): Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xiv-556 p. 16 × 23,5. \$67.95

**Taylor**, Bernard A. (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (SBLSCS 51). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xviii-581 p. 14 × 21,5. \$69.95

**Tescione**, Cesare, "*Fiumi di acqua viva sgorgheranno dal suo seno*" (Gv 7,38). Napoli, RCE Edizioni, 2001. 96 p. 15 × 21

**Theissen**, Gerd, *La religion des premiers chrétiens*. Une théorie du christianisme primitif (Initiations au christianisme ancien). Traduit de l'allemand par Joseph Hoffmann. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002. 528 p. 13 × 21. €38,00

**Thompson**, Marianne Meye, *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001. x-269 p. 15 × 23. \$22.00 – £14.99

**Tillich**, Paul, *Teologia sistematica*. Volume secondo: L'esistenza e il Cristo (Sola Scriptura 18). Torino, Claudiana, 2001. 220 p. 15,5 × 21. €18,00 – Lit. 34,853

**Trevijano**, Ramón, *La Biblia en el cristianismo antiguo*. Prenicenos, Gnósticos, Apócrifos (Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia 10). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2001. 488 p. 15 × 22,5. P 4.500

**Tuell**, Steven S., *First and Second Chronicles* (Interpretation; A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching). Louisville, John Knox Press, 2001. xii-252 p. 16 × 23,5. £20.00

**Verhey**, Allen, *Remembering Jesus*. Christian Community, Scripture, and the Moral Life. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. xii-526 p. 16,5 × 24. \$35.00 – £24.99

**Vermes**, Geza, *La religione di Gesù l'ebreo*. Una grande sfida al cristianesimo (Studi cristologici). Assisi, Cittadella Editrice, 2002. 302 p. 14 × 21. €25,50

*Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 11/2. Sirach (Ecclesiasticus). 8. Lieferung: Sir. 20,1–23,6. Hrsg. Walter Thiele. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2001. pp. 561-640. 24 × 32

*Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 26 (Pars II). *Apocalypsis Johannis*. Fascicule 3. Apc 2,7–4,3. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2001. pp. 161-240. 24 × 32

*Vetus Latina: 45. Arbeitsbericht der Stiftung, 34. Bericht des Instituts*. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2001. 44 p. 15 × 21

**Viviano**, Benedict T., OP, *Trinity – Kingdom – Church*. Essays in Biblical Theology (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 48). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. 304 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 85.–

**Watts**, James W. (ed.), *Persia and Torah*. The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch (SBL Symposium Series 17). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xi-228 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

**Williams**, Peter J., *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 12). Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill, 2001. xv-202 p. 16 × 24,5. €64 – Dfl 141,04 – \$75.00

**Williamson**, Peter S., *Catholic Principles for Interpreting Scripture*. A Study of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* (Subsidia Biblica 22). Preface by Albert Vanhoye, SJ. Rome Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001. xxii-400 p. 17 × 24. €25,82 – Lit. 50.000 – \$28.00

**Witherington**, Ben – **Ice**, Laura M., *The Shadow of the Almighty*. Father, Son, and Spirit in Biblical Perspective. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. xii-156 p. 15 × 23. \$14.00 – £9.99

**Witherup**, Ronald D., *Biblical Fundamentalism*. What Every Catholic Should Know. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2001. xiv-90 p. 13,5 21. \$8.95

**Work**, Telford, *Living and Active*. Scripture in the Economy of Salvation (Sacra Doctrina). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. xx-343 p. 16 × 24. \$35.00 – £24.99

**Zilkha**, Avraham, *Modern English-Hebrew Dictionary*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2002. vi-457 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Hardback: £40.00; paperback: £17.50

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: [atla@atla.com](mailto:atla@atla.com). <http://www.atla.com/>

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il ?? dicembre 2002

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma